THE TYPES OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

THE TYPES OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

With a Foreword by Dr S K De, M A , D Lit. (Lon.)

BY

D R MANKAD

1936

URMI PRAKASHAN MANDIR

DENSO HALL, KARACHI

Printed at
PRABHAT PRESS
Denso Hall,
Karachi

पितरौ वन्दे

देवानामिदमामनन्ति मुनय कान्त क्रतु चाक्षुष
रुद्रेणेदमुमाकृतव्यतिकरे स्वागे विभक्त द्विधा।
त्रैगुण्योद्भवमत्र लोकचरित नानारसं दृश्यते
नाट्य भिन्नरुचेर्जनस्य बहुधाप्येक समाराधनम्॥

FOREWORD

It gives me great pleasure to have this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the work of my young friend Mr D. R. Mankad, who is already known as the author of several admirable papers on Sanskrit dramatic theory and practice and recommending it to all students of Sanskrit literature

Sanskrit Dramaturgy is one of the many subjects which still await general as well as special investigation The allied subject of Sanskrit Poetics has just begun to be systematically studied, but Dramaturgy and Histrionic Art are subjects which are still practically unexplored As most of the original texts were still unknown uncertain or unavailable very few scholars have hitherto seriously ventured to undertake a critical enquiry In popular books published in India and abroad on the other hand some wild theories have occasionally been set forth without the slightest justification Now that sufficient materials are available, it is necessary to make a deeper and more accurate study and we can for this reason, heartily welcome the fruits of Mr Mankad's labours presented in the following pages.

There can hardly be any doubt that the subject itself with a literature going back to several centuries is deserving of careful and detailed study It is not Mr Mankad's ambition to write an exhaustive account or to make a comparative study, but he limits himself to the modest object of examining critically the Sanskrit dramatic theory which directed the evolution of the different dramatic types and controlled their technique. He has been able to bring together an amount of material from an intensive study of the dramaturgic as well as dramatic texts, and whatever judgment may be passed on the conclusions he has drawn, the documentary value of his work can hardly be disputed. He has wisely eschewed the more tempting course of producing an

imposing work, containing bird's eye views or sweeping generalisations' on the basis of meagre and generally unreliable facts and opinions He realises that on the pioneer investigator in this comparatively little known field falls the more humble but more important duty of a patient and conscientious collection of first hand facts which are indeed the links without which the chain of historical summary or even of any kind of generalisation cannot be properly forged In the present state of our knowledge it is not expected that all the difficulties and obscurities will be solved with absolute certainty or that all scholars will agree with every statement made, but the young author with the judgment and insight of more mature years has expressed very lucidly what he has to say and has exhibited not only a thorough familiarity with theory but also a complete mastery of details, controlled and ordered by the sobriety of true scholarship It will be a source of satisfaction if his little book, as one of the pioneer contributions on a difficult and complicated problem, is able to draw the attention of interested scholars and further stimulate research in an almost untrodden field

University of Dacca
2 2 1936

S K De

PREFACE

After the modern revival of Sanskrit studies Sanskrit plays are widely read and studied but the study of Sanskrit Dramatic theory has been most sadly neglected A detailed and critical study of Sanskrit Dramaturgy in all its branches is a desideratum With a view to meet with this want to some extent, I have undertaken the publication of this small volume

In the following pages I have attempted to ascertain the nature of the types of Sanskrit Drama (रूपक as well as उपरूपक) in their origin and development The subject being entirely such as has not been studied in modern days I have given full information from the original Sanskrit dramaturgical works Incidentally I have ventured to discuss certain problems connected with the subject but the conclusions drawn are mere suggestions. And I shall consider myself more than amply rewarded for my labours if they will stimulate further critical study in this direction This forms only one chapter in the vast study of the Sanskrit Dramatic theory

I am extremely grateful to Dr S K. De of the Dacca University for writing the Foreword to the present work and for encouraging me in these studies I am also thankful to Prof B K Thakore and Prof. K. H Dhruva both of whom have made valuable suggestions during the course of my studies.

Department of Sanskrit,
D J Sind College Karachi

10-4 36

D. R. MANKAD

ABBREVIATIONS

[Following is the list of abbreviations used for the works, more frequently quoted during the course of this work]

NS = नाट्यशास्त्र Nir Press
AP = अग्निपुराण (c 825 AD) Anandasrama S
Abh = अभिनवभारती (c 975-1015) GOS
DR = दशरूप (c 974-995) ed. by Haas 1912
SP = शृङ्गारप्रकाश (c 1050-1100) as qd in BP-Introd
KS = काव्यानुशासन (c 1084-1173) Nir Press
ND = नाट्यदर्पण (1093-1175) GOS
BP = भावप्रकाशन (c 1175-1250) GOS
PR = प्रतापरुद्रीय (c. 1275-1325) ed by K P Trivedi
RS = रसार्णवसुधाकर (c 1330) Trivandrum S S
SD = साहित्यदर्पण (c 1300-40) ed by Kane, 1923 App E
Mtr = मातृगुप्त as quoted by राघवभट्ट on शाकुन्तल Nir Press
SR = सङ्गीतरत्नाकर ASS
NSD = नाट्यसर्वस्वदीपिका A Ms in B O R I
RK = रसकौमुदी ,, ,,
BSG = भरतशास्त्रग्रन्थ ,, ,,
BA = भरतार्णव ,, ,,
SDK = सिद्धान्तकौमुदी

CONTENTS

Cha

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY

A general study of the extant Sanskrit dramas leaves an impression that our Drama was, as it were, still-born It would seem that from the earliest plays of भास and कालिदास to the latest dramas of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there has been very little advance in its technique The earliest drama known, already shows a form, which was crystalised in its structure and even in its theme[1] Sanskrit dramatists, as it were, lacked in imagination and experimentation. There does not appear to have been any bold departure from the standard drama, as far as its technique goes Nay more, even the theory, as fixed by भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र, as early as कालिदास or most probably earlier than his age, presupposes a type of drama which has been truly represented by our extant dramas Thus our earliest dramas and our earliest theory of Dramatics, both show a form of drama which was fully developed and on which there has been very little advance

Why is this so? Can we reasonably believe in such a state of things? We shall try to answer these questions during the course of this

1 Even [illegible] the [illegible] published under the name of [illegible] and which appears to be his, shows all the technical details as prescribed in the theory known to us The नान्दी, the प्रस्तावना, the [illegible]s the [illegible]s and the set style of the theme—all are in perfect harmony with the theory

little volume, but for the present, we shall have to collect data for the purpose In order to understand the essential nature of our drama, it is necessary that we should undertake a detailed study of all the types of drama as represented in practice and theory Fortunately for us, a work of encyclopaedic nature on this subject, has recently been brought to light and published in the Gaekwad Oriental Series, under the title of भावप्रकाशनम् Though this work belongs to a very late period and though its text, as available, is almost a confused mass of inaccuracy, a careful study of the work helps us in formulating certain broad ideas as to the gradual development of our Drama I shall, therefore, undertake a detailed study of the various types of Sanskrit Drama as described in our extant dramaturgical texts

Our dramaturgists have, it seems, very early, distinguished between the art of histrionics (नाट्य) and the art of dancing (नृत्य or नृत्त), and as some of the types of our Drama are based on नृत्त and others on नाट्य, it becomes essential for us to understand clearly these terms, before we study the forms of Drama themselves

1 नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य

These three terms are very often explained in the works on Sanskrit Dramaturgy, but there is a divergence of opinion as regards the sense attached to them नृत्त and नृत्य are usually derived from the root नृत्, while नाट्य is derived from the

root नट्[2]. If we can ascertain the distinctions, if any, between these two roots, it will be easier for us to arrive at the exact senses of the above three terms

नृत् and नट्

Chronologically, the usage in literature shows नृत् to be an earlier root, yet there is a difference of opinion about the origin of these two roots. It was Weber[3], who first pointed out that नट् is a prakritisation of नृत्. There is also a view[4], which takes नृत् to be a sanskritised root from नट्, which according to them, would be the

2 रामचन्द्र in his ND advances another view (P 23)

नाटकमिति नाटयति विचित्रं रञ्जनाप्रवेशेन सभ्यानां हृदयं नर्तयतीति नाटकम्। अभिनयगुणस्तु नतनार्थस्यापि नटेर्नाटकशब्दं व्युत्पादयन्ति तत्र तु घटादित्वेन ह्रस्वाभावश्चिन्त्यः। यदपि कथान्योऽपि श्रोतृहृदयं नाटयति तथाप्यकोपायादीनां वैचित्र्यहेतूनामभावात् न तथा रञ्जकत्वमिति न तेन नाटकम्।

This view if correct, may lead us to derive नाट्य from नाट् and so नट् will have no place in the evolution of नाट्य But there are other considerations which militate against taking नाट् as the root for नाट्य or नाटक Most probably with ND's sole exception there is no other attempt known to derive नाट्य from नाट्. For lengthening of the vowel there is the grammarian's sanction, as the roots with penultimate short vowel do so in forming Potential Participles But apart from that, there is the sanction of पाणिनि (IV, 3, 129) in deriving नाट्य from नट Compare also the following (NSD f. 278)

नटत्वेनेन नटन नटकृतादिनिर्दिष्टम्

नटस्य कर्म नाट्यम्।

On the whole, then it seems correct to connect नाट्य with नट्

3 *A History of Indian Literature*, Weber, 3rd edition P 197

4 This view was expressed in कौमुदी a leading Gujarati monthly journal March and May 1931

original root But both these views seem to be erroneous (that is, if the votaries of the first view take नट् to be an original Prakrit root) नट् is not a Prakrit root at all, for it is not used in that form anywhere in the Prakrit Literature Prakrit lexicons only show the root नड्, not नट्, which fact alone is enough to show that नट् was never regarded as a Prakrit root There are forms like नट्ट seen in Prakrit Literature[5] but a root like नट् would only yield णड् Thus, as far as the evidence of actual usage goes, नट् cannot be taken as a Prakrit root Nor is the second view correct, according to which, नृत् would be a root later than नट् Here again the actual usage falsifies any such theory, नृत् is seen in ऋग्वेद[6] itself, while the earliest usage of नट् is met with in पाणिनि[7], proving नृत् to be an earlier root It is true that much is to be taken for granted in calling नट् a later root, simply because its usage is not seen earlier One may argue that it might have been used in spoken language only But the continuous absence of this word in all the earlier literature, makes it probable that it was a later root And this appears to be quite reasonable Both नृत् and नट् are used in Sanskrit

5 I am indebted for this information to Pandit Bechardas who is an erudite Prakrit Scholar and who was a Professor at Gujarat Vidyapith, at Ahamadabad But it is possible that this नट्ट is a reflection of Prakrit equivalents of नाट्य like नट्ट etc

6 RV X 18 3 X 29 2 VIII 37 7, VIII, 81, 3 VIII, 24, 9 I 130 7 etc

7 IV, 3 110 111

Literature[8] and though there may have been some confusion in the usage of these roots at first, it seems quite likely that they soon came to denote two different concepts नृत् indicated a particular form of entertainment But as this form of entertainment developed and incorporated new features into it, it became necessary to find out a word which would indicate this newly developed form of entertainment So नट् came to denote a form of entertainment which had developed from the form of entertainment indicated by the root नृत् and which for that same reason was necessarily later Thus too नृत् seems to be an earlier root According to this reasoning, नृत् will have the sense of dancing and नट् that of acting

Now it will be seen that at the time when नट् was given a sense different from that of नृत् (and this must have happened when नट् was accepted as a Sanskrit root, even if it be taken as a Prakrit root at first), the two forms of entertainment, arising from the same action, had been permanently separated and had gained their individual traits नाट्य, which is distinct from नृत्त (as we shall presently see), must have come into existence just before the root नट् was distinguished from नृत् It is probable, that the root नट् first meant 'to dance' and later as [illegible] developed, came to mean 'acting' Following [illegible] support such a view[9]

8 It is possible that नट् is a further evolved form of नृत्.

9 SDK P 196

नट नृत्तौ । इत्थमेन पूर्वमपि पठितम् । तत्राय विवेक ।
पूर्वं पठितस्य नाट्यमर्थ । यत्कारिषु नटव्यपदेश ।

Thus it may seem that नट् had both these senses and it would be quite natural to suppose that the earlier sense was 'dancing' and as it developed it came to mean 'acting' It should also be remembered that in पाणिनि, नट्, नट, and नाट्य—all the three terms are seen, and this may show a definite development of the word नट्, as distinguished from नृत्, for even in the above passage from SDK, नाट्य has been assigned the sense of 'acting' not of 'dancing'

But, just as नट् is found to have been used in both the senses, नाट्य, too, has been assigned both these senses in certain works In the prelude to a work called नाट्यसर्वस्वदीपिका, a ms in possession of the Govt Oriental Library at B O R I, the following is found (fol 10ᵃ)[10]

भरता बहुधा सन्ति नान्दिसारस्वदादय
तपो प्रमाणमादिश्च भरतस्स उमापति
अत एवादिभरतप्रकार नटन स्मृतम्
नाटकानु क ग्राया दशरूपकम् हरा
शैलूषसूत्रधाराद्यै पुत्तिकाप्रतिमादिभि
वेशभाषाविकारादिकल्पनाभिर्नेहृदृस्त
तस्माद्ध्रुवस्य नृत्तस्य प्रमाण न भवन्ति ते

10 For a discussion about the identity of this ms, see my paper on भाविभाव, in the *Annals of B O R I*, Vol. XIII No 11, P 173 ff Also cf The same, Vol XV, Parts I II, P 89 ff I am indebted to the Curator for the use of the ms

नटन नाटिकानां च तेषां करणैव हि

तस्मान्नाट्यस्य शुद्धात् , शास्त्रसिद्धं प्रवक्ष्यति

This shows that according to this work नाट्य was not the same as रूपक. It was mere वृत्त or नृत्य and this is amply corroborated by the definitions of the 37 types of नाट्य as given in this work. Further, in this work the author takes an opportunity of deriving the words नाट्य and नृत्य (fol. 28), wherein he describes नाट्य as the art of नट्, and then includes under it ताण्डव, नर्तन and लास्य This classification is evidently based on some sort of differentiation between नाट्य and नर्तन, and in the light of the above passage, it being impossible to understand नाट्य in the sense of drama, it must have the sense of नृत्य as understood by DR and others

Thus नाट्य seems to have been used in the sense of नृत्य and नाट्य and perhaps of वृत्त That it had both these senses is also seen in मालविकाग्निमित्रम् It mentions a नाट्य called छलित or चलित which was properly acted by मालविका The character of चलित as described in the drama was that of नृत्य it was certainly not a drama, nor was it a mere वृत्त type As there is the express mention यथारसमभिनयति after the stanza recited by मालविका, it is obvious that it was a type which involved अभिनय and this was the technical nature of नृत्य [11] नाट्य, thus, here refers

11 It seems that कालिदास recognised the principle that भाव was at the root of नृत्य The fact that he calls the two भावार्थ भावs incarnate suggests it Thus also चलित was a नृत्य type

to नृत्य [12] Same is the nature of नाटय as used in NSD मालविकाग्निमित्रम् knows नाटय in the sense of drama also गणदास eulogises नाटय thus (I, 4) [13]

> देवानामिदमामनन्ति मुनय शान्त क्रतु चाक्षुष
> रुद्रेणेदमुमाकृतव्यतिकरे स्वाङ्गे विभक्त द्विधा ।
> त्रैगुण्योद्भवमत्र लोकचरित नानारस दृश्यते
> नाटय भिन्नरुचेर्जनस्य बहुधाप्येक समाराधनम् ॥

This stanza characterises नाटय as one where लोकचरित is seen, which would, necessarily refer to drama proper, rather than to an ordinary नृत्यप्रकार [14]

12 Following note by Prof B K Thakore will be interesting पञ्चाङ्गाभिनय and चलित are distinguished by कालिदास Former is acting on the stage by the fully trained नट complete in all respects It is highest proficiency in this many sided art चलित is the penultimate step, only after it is mastered can the pupil be taught the former In चलित नृत्य including (and enhancing the effects of) संगीत is performed as by a mere नर्तकी, then अभिनय by itself (without नृत्त or सगीत) as by a नटी For चलित then, it is essential that (a) the passage to be performed must be short (b) yet should embody several रसs and अवस्थाs in a sequence that is natural or at least possible (c) that the 2nd half of the performance (i e अभिनय or नाटय proper) should be exhibited immediately after the first half, and that (d) the आचार्य or प्राश्निक judges this 2nd half in relation to what he has just seen and heard चलित, therefore (and *a fortiori* the earlier stages also) is purely a school room exercise not a kind of public performance on the stage in any sense

13 cf NS I, 78

14 Following note, too by Prof B K Thakore is worth quoting This stanza covers the whole gamut (a) नृत्त the merely physical movements (including appropriate expression and

All this shows that नट as well as नाट्य was, at one time or the other, used in both the senses of acting and dancing But this should not be difficult to explain Our earlier analysis of नट् being used for a form of entertainment distinct from the *one represented by नृत्, would lead us to believe that* almost as early as the root नट् came into existence, a distinct sense was given to it However, it is quite possible that in the beginning, there must have been a confusion in the use of both these roots नृत् and नट्, one being very often used for the other And the theorists would recognise the distinction *only* after the sense had been *fully* crystalised in the popular usage Thus the fact that we do have usages showing both the senses

movements of eye eye-brow face hands shoulders breasts hips and of course also the feet and their toes)

(b) नृत्य—the above plus recitation or singing without any flaw or impropriety in tune with and in full accord with the sense of the words

(c) नाट्याभिनय—the above (a) or (a+b) plus acting proper Where not wanted, or inappropriate गीत or अभिनय or both would be dropped

It also distinguishes between

(1) Male and female or **(2)** ताण्डव style and लास्य style and recognises the intimate connection of the theatre with the लोकवृत्त and the three वृत्तs at the root of infinite play and variety of the real human drama which नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य copy and reproduce in miniature by the use of some conventions so as to present an artistically unified picture within convenient limits of time space and resources.

That is why says the stanza all sorts and conditions of spectators are pleased by this as by nothing else

of नट्, should refer to the period of transition during which नट् was used in both the senses

Whatever may be the time when नट् and नृत् were finally distinguished in senses, it seems almost certain that according to the above discussion, नृत् was earlier than नट् This is borne out by the technical difference in the senses assigned to the words नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य (as used in our dramaturgical works) into the nature of which we shall now inquire

नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य

If नट् is distinguished from नृत् as suggested above, there must be similar distinctions between the forms of entertainment denoted by these roots This we can learn from the works on dramaturgy Let us, then, see what evidence we get about the nature of these terms in various dramaturgical works

(MMC P 59)

> धीरोदात्ताद्यवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्य रसाश्रयम्
> तादृङ् नाट्य द्विधा प्रोक्त नृत्तनृत्यविभागत
> भावाश्रय तु नृत्त नृत्य तालल्याश्रयम्

(SR, 7th अध्याय)

> नाट्य नृत्य तथा नृत्त त्रेधा तदिति कीर्तितम् ।
> नाट्यशब्दो रसे मुख्यो रसाभिव्यक्तिकारणम् ॥२७॥
> आङ्गिकाभिनयैरेव भावानेव व्यनक्ति यत्
> तन्नृत्य मार्गशब्देन प्रसिद्ध नृत्यवादिनाम् ॥२८॥

गात्रविक्षेपमात्रं तु सर्वाभिनयवर्जितम्
आङ्गिकोक्तप्रकारेण नृत्तं नृत्तविदो विदुः ॥२०॥

(BP P 181)

दशरूपात्मकं तच्च वाक्यार्थाभिनयात्मकम्
रसाश्रयं तत्पदार्थाभिनयात्मकम्
नृत्यं भावाश्रयं नृत्तं रसाद्यनुदाहृतम्
नृत्यनृत्तविभागश्च बहुभिर्बहुधोदितः
तदुक्तं नाट्यवेदिना भूयसा ह्युपकारकम्
नृत्यनृत्तविभागस्तु यस्मात्कथ्यते

(DR I, 7-13)

अवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्यं रूपं दृश्यतयोच्यते
रूपकं तत्समारोपाद्दशधैव रसाश्रयम्
अन्यद्भावाश्रयं नृत्यं नृत्तं ताललयाश्रयम्

(PR P 100-1)

. . नाट्यं रसाश्रयम्
भावाश्रयं तु नृत्तं नृत्यं ताललयाश्रयम्

SDK P 196)

वाक्यार्थाभिनयो नाट्यम् । पदार्थाभिनयो नृत्यम् । गात्रविक्षेपमात्रं तु नृत्तम् ।

Let us now examine the result of these various views with regard to the nature of नाट्य नृत्य and नृत्त We shall, for the present, leave apart the views expressed in NS and Abh Following table clearly shows the various views about these terms

Work	नृत्त	नृत्य	नाट्य
1 MMC	भावाश्रयम्	ताललयाश्रयम्	रसाश्रयम्
2 PR	,,	,,	,,
3 DR	ताललयाश्रयम्	भावाश्रयम्	,,
4 SR	,,	,,	,,
5 BP	रसाश्रयम्	,,	नृत्त = नाट्य
6 SDK[15]	ताललयाश्रयम्	,,	रसाश्रयम्

Above analysis shows that all are agreed about the technical aspect of नाट्य, but there is a difference of opinion about the other two It will be noted that in MMC and PR the terms नृत्त and नृत्य are 'curiously interchanged', while BP is alone in describing नृत्त as रसाश्रयम्, thus equating it with नाट्य Let us examine the reasons for this confusion MMC and PR are very late in date, in comparison with DR and SR They do not seem to preserve any earlier traditions about this point Therefore, this curious interchange does not seem to be intentional, and one may rely more on DR which has been recognised as the standard text-book on dramaturgy and from which all other later works have profusely drawn their materials

15 The quotation from this work as given above when read in connection with BP and SR suggests that the author believed in 'the same view as held by DR About नृत्त SDK is clear and as नृत्य is called पदार्थाभिनयात्मकम्, it is clearly based on भाव so is नाट्य based on रस as it is taken as वाक्यार्थाभिनयात्मकम्

But in order to understand clearly the import of these terms, we shall have to keep in mind the subtle distinction between भाव and रस DR, after defining नृत्य and नृत्त as noted above, further adds [15]

आद्यं पदार्थाभिनयो मार्गो देशी तथा परम्

So do BP and SR and SDK describes नृत्य as पदार्थाभिनयात्मकम् This clearly makes नृत्य, a further evolved form of नृत्त नृत्त is the original form of entertainment on which नृत्य was an improvement Our above analysis shows that नृत्त involved ताल and लय only, not भाव, while नृत्य, was essentially connected with भाव [17] and producing भाव in the minds of the audience, is an art far more advanced than mere गात्रविक्षेप Thus too, नृत्त seems to be earlier SR clearly points out that नृत्त involved mere movements of limbs without any अभिनय A dancer would move his or her limbs in harmony with music (or probably this required very little of music as rhythmical movement of limbs only was essential to नृत्त) There was no acting in नृत्त That was added to नृत्य Proper acting would create भाव in the minds of the audience Thus in नृत्य, the actor had to act in such a manner that a corresponding भाव would be created in the minds of the spectators Imagine a child dancing on some joyous occasion and add to this motion of the child, rhythm and ताल and you have नृत्त नृत्त

16 cf नर्तित used in the sense of नृत्य in मालविका० I 5
17 DR I, 15

thus, is dance, while नृत्य is mimetic art. If we realise this essential difference between नृत्त and नृत्य (as seen in DR), it will be seen that नृत्त which is based on ताल only, must be very primitive. As it developed and as the abstract notions of भाव and रस evolved, this same नृत्त, incorporating as it did, further elements, assumed first the form of नृत्य and then the form of नाट्य. Thus both नृत्य and नाट्य, it can be safely said, are further evolved forms of नृत्त. This evolutionary distinction is noticed by Abh also. Abh at P. 184, gives the following divisions of नृत्त (1) मसृण (2) उद्धत (3) मसृणमिश्र (4) उद्धतमिश्र (5) that which includes harmonious motions of hands and feet as in रेचक and अङ्गहार (6) that which includes music leading to अभिनय (7) that which follows music and वाद्यताल with harmonious motion of limbs. It will be seen that the first four divisions are based on a principle, distinct from the one on which are based the last three. These three can be resolved into two types only—one which has pure गात्रविक्षेप and in which hands and feet are moved in harmony with भाण्डवाद्य and the second which includes अभिनय, with harmonious motion of limbs following music. (And it will be recognised that these two are the same as नृत्त and नृत्य.) These two types of नृत्त are further on taken as distinct from नाट्य as is understood from the following:

प्रथम भेद लौकिके स्वतन्त्रनृत्ते देवतातोषणादौ वा । द्वितीय पूर्वरङ्ग-विधेा परिशिष्टनृत्तलक्षणगतया (Abh 181)

This means that the first type, which is वृत्त was quite distinct and the second type, which is नृत्य was useful in नाट्य Thus both these are distinct from नाट्य

It will now be seen that there is no technical difference between the views of SR and DR on the one hand and PR and MMC on the other, only there is an interchange in naming. And bearing in mind that DR and SR are both earlier than PR and MMC, the servile characters of the last two and the literal senses[18] of the words वृत्त and नृत्य, one is inclined to follow DR

Why, then, did शारदातनय equate वृत्त with नाट्य by calling it रसाश्रयम्? But शारदातनय also records another view In the tenth अध्याय he writes[19]

> नाट्यस्य प्रविभागस्तु यथाशास्त्रं प्रदर्श्यते
> नाटकस्थितवाक्यार्थपदार्थाभिनयात्मकम्
> नटकर्मैव नाट्यं स्यादिति नाट्यविदां मतम्
> पदार्थमात्राभिनयरूपं नर्तककर्म यत्
> त नृत्यभेदेन तद्द्वयं द्विविधं भवेत्
> तत्र भावाश्रयो मार्गो देशी तद्रहिता मता
> त्रिमार्गतालनियतं मार्गमित्यभिधीयते
> देशी भवेत्तु नस्तालनैराश्रयमिष्यते

This is, as if reiterating the view of DR It is well-known that BP is a compendium of the works

18 Both नृत्त and नृत्य are to be derived from नृत्, नृत्त being its Past P P and नृत्य its Potential P Thus too नृत्य which means 'worthy of dancing shows an advance upon नृत्त meaning danced only

19 BR P 296

on dramaturgy known to शारदातनय, and he very often, mentions, with or without acknowledgements, various views on the subjects he is dealing with It may have been so in this case But the view which considers नृत्त and नाट्य as identical, is found in one other place also NS notes a पूर्वपक्ष (which does not seem a पूर्वपक्ष as such, but a mere objection forestalled by the auther himself) which it has refuted. When भरत explained the origin of नृत्त, the sages asked him [20]

> यदा प्राप्त्यर्थमर्थानां तज्ज्ञैरभिनयः कृतः
> कस्मान्नृत्तं कृतं ह्येतत्कं स्वभावमपेक्षते
> न गीतकार्थसम्बद्धं न चाप्यर्थस्य भावकम्
> कस्मान्नृत्तं कृतं ह्येतद्गीतेष्वासारितेषु च

To this doubt the reply is given thus

> अत्रोच्यते न खल्वर्थं कंचिन्नृत्तमपेक्षते
> किन्तु शोभां जनयतीत्यतो नृत्तं प्रवर्तितम्
> प्रायेण सर्वलोकस्य नृत्तमिष्टं स्वभावतः
> माङ्गल्यमिति कृत्वा च नृत्तमेतत्प्रकीर्तितम्
> विवाहप्रसवावाहप्रमोदाभ्युदयादिषु
> विनोदकरणं चेति नृत्तमेतत्प्रवर्तितम्

This doubt and its answer clearly show that even according to NS, नृत्त had no other purpose than to amuse the minds of people This नृत्त would, therefore, be almost the same as explained by DR This summary treatment of the पूर्वपक्ष, in NS, has been very elaborately discussed in Abh Abhinava has summarised the argument of the

20 NS IV, 241 248

पूर्वपक्ष that नृत्त and नृत्त are identical, by advancing three possible issues and then has refuted all these three and then established that नृत्त and नृत्य were not identical He closes his long discussion by the remark [21]

एव नाट्याद्भिन्नता नृत्तस्य गीतादिवदुपरञ्जकस्य समर्थित ।

But in so doing Abh brings out two or three points which are of immense value to us in the present enquiry The पूर्वपक्ष, according to Abh, considered that there existed non-distinction between नृत्त and नाट्य, mainly for the reason that both had अभिनय in them In saying so, the पूर्वपक्ष distinguishes two varieties of नृत्त One which is absolutely void of अभिनय (and consists of bending, turning, raising of eye-brows, moving of eye-balls and feet, trembling, throbbing and bending of waist and other forms of रेचकादि) is pure नृत्त according to the पूर्वपक्ष, and the one which includes अभिनय is the same as नाट्य (See P 174 comm ll 22-3 to P 175 ll 1-2) Thus the controversy is about the second kind, for even the पूर्वपक्ष calls the first variety as नृत्त, and as such quite distinct from नाट्य It is the second variety that is identified with नाट्य

As against this Abh distinguishes between these two i e between the second variety and नाट्य He says (P 177-8)

नृत्त (by which the above second variety is meant), cannot be the same as नाट्य, for there is

21 NS (G O S) P 181

no अभिनय in नृत्त as you point out to be. It may be urged against this that in नृत्तकाव्यs like डोम्बिका, the नर्तकी tries to attract the mind of the king, by music etc., and thus these नृत्तकाव्यs must contain अभिनय. But Abh. says that the अभिनय required in नृत्तकाव्यs is distinct from the अभिनय required in नाट्य. In नृत्तकाव्यs, the नर्तकी does resort to अङ्गव्यापार by proper gesticulations of eyes etc., but all that is for attracting the king in whose presence she dances. Thus this अभिनय of नर्तकी excites the passion of the king but the अभिनय of a नट is for playing the role of some one else and thus he has to show feelings etc., as experienced by another person and make them manifest on the stage, by visible representation. A नर्तकी does not play any one's role and in her case she has nothing to represent visibly. All that she has to do, is to attract the heart of the king by personal appeal, as it were, through her gesticulations. She has not to put on any one's dress etc. (thus आहार्याभिनय is almost absent in her case).

This distinction, so descriptively, brought out by Abh., has really a very important significance. We have seen that according to DR and others, नृत्य was considered भावाश्रयम् and नाट्य was रसाश्रयम्. Here, too, the नृत्त that includes अभिनय, is shown to have the capacity of exciting the भाव only while the feelings evoked in the hearts of the spectators by नाट्य, are shown to have a lengthy process, which really means that रस is evoked. Thus Abh. refutes the arguments of the पूर्वपक्ष by

saying that his second variety of नृत्त has a sort of अभिनय, but it can produce भाव only, not रस, which would be evoked only by नाट्य which, therefore, is distinct from this second variety of नृत्त

Now it will be seen that the distinction between नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य as known to DR and others, is also recognised by Abh only, he does not use the term नृत्य but embraces both नृत्त and नृत्य of DR by नृत्त, of which, however, two aspects corresponding to DR's नृत्त and नृत्य, are distinguished as shown above

It seems that this distinction between नृत्त and नाट्य, was known to हर्ष, मङ्गल and भट्टोद्भट, as is seen from the following quotation found in Abh

रसभावव्यञ्जकस्थितिरभ्यासादयदङ्ग पूर्वं चारी वा नृत्त एव नाट्यहेतवो भेदस्तु नामधेयत्वं इति हर्षवार्तिकम्। गीतार्थाभिनयेन अन्यत्र नृत्तकनिबन्धनाम्नाद्दृष्टेन नृत्तान्तरतत्त्वं इति मङ्गलः। समन्वयात्र इत्यादि मिहलक्षणद्विवादो इति भट्टोद्भटः।

Thus the view that नृत्त and नाट्य are identical seems to have sprung up out of the confusion that would arise when नृत्त was developing into नृत्य. At that time no distinct notions could have been formed about the two different varieties and therefore नृत्त and नृत्य were known by the same term नृत्त This confusion is bound to happen in such a transitional period But when these two forms had crystalised they came to be differently known as नृत्त and नृत्य. This confusion between नृत्त and नाट्य is seen in SDK and NSD In several other places also such a use of the term नाट्य is found which

would be reminiscent of the above noted transitional period

Now it will be seen that शारदातनय, presumably referred to such a view as has been presupposed by Abh But in reality they all (i e all our extant theorists) took नृत्त to be quite distinct from नाट्य From the point of view of evolution, first comes नृत्त, then नृत्य and last नाट्य नृत्त is mere dance, नृत्य had gesture added to it, while नाट्य had speech (i e dialogue) too Thus नाट्य incorporated all the three features–dance, music and speech–which are so essential for the creation of drama This technical difference between नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य should be fully borne in mind for the detailed study of our dramas

2 रूपक and उपरूपक

It will now be seen that India has witnessed three distinct forms of entertainment, based on नृत्त नृत्य and नाट्य, but the one based on नृत्त never seems to have attained to the position of a drama It remained for the court hall of the king and for the court yard of the temple It was an accomplishment of the courtezan from whom even the princes and princesses learnt the art But as the tastes of the people were cultivated and as their general culture evolved further, they were not satisfied by mere rhythmic dancing They had to invent newer forms of entertainment and they soon saw that their original dance combined with histrionics and with music gave them the

necessary variety This they adopted and called नृत्त But the society was progressing fast, their mental horizon was ever widening, their abstract thinking was ever getting deeper and deeper. They then, wanted still subtler form of entertainment They evolved नाट्य, and by gradual degrees took it to a height of refinement which even to-day evokes the admiration of all the civilized peoples The form of entertainment based on नृत्य, our dramaturgists called उपरूपक* and the one based on नाट्य, they designated as रूपक

There was a technical difference between रूपक and उपरूपक, which is very well brought out by हेमचन्द्र (who has appropriated the whole passage from Abh) in the following extract (KS P 329-330)

अथ पाठ्यस्य गेयस्य च रूपकस्य को भेद । अयमाहुराचार्याः—पाठ्ये हि अङ्ग गीत चेत्युभयमपि निष्ठितम् । तथा हि करकरणादि मण्डलादि यत्तत्राङ्गोपयोगि तत्स्वरूपेण लयादिव्यवस्थया चानियतमेव यथारस प्रयुज्यमानत्वेन विपर्यासात् । गेये तु गीतमङ्ग च द्वयमपि स्वप्रतिष्ठितम् । तथा हि यस्य यादृश लययति स्वरूपादिक निरूपित तत्र विपर्ययति मन्त्रादिवत् । यद्यपि क्वचिद्गीतेः प्राधान्य यथा प्रस्थानादौ, क्वचिद्वाद्यप्राधान्य यथा भाणकादिषु मसृणालयरिक्तपाठे, क्वचिद्गीतमानसूचकाभिधेयप्राधान्य यथा द्विपदिकादिप्रयोगान्तर हुडुक्कारावसरे । अतएव तत्र लोकभाषया वर्तिमार्ग इति प्रसिद्धि । तथापि गीताद्यन्तरेण वाद्यादे प्रधान इति गेयमिति निर्दिष्टम् । . .

किं च पाठ्ये साक्षात्कारकल्पानुव्यवसायमवस्तुविषया । न पात्र प्रति भाषानियमस्य नियमस्य छन्दोऽलङ्कारादेश्चाभिधीयते अपद्मन्यास्तेरपि तु यथा लयतालादिना यादृगर्थसूचनेनाप्यभिनयः सात्त्विकादि प्रभावरसानुसारितया प्रयोगेऽप्यन्तरुचितार्थपरिपूर्ण ध्रुवागीतेन क्रियते । गेये च मन्त्रादिवत् वस्तुभूतस्वरसादिभव्यपानि विपर्ययविपर्ययोजनया कृता प्रतीति साक्षा . व्युत्पत्त्यभिधान च

*For the actual usage of the word etc see further

गेय नास्ति । पाठ्ये तु तदेव प्रधानं भरतमुनिप्रभृतिना तथैव मूलत प्रवृत्तेरित्यल बहुना अप्रस्तुतप्रपञ्चेनेति ।

It will be seen that गेय of हेमचन्द्र is our नृत्त or उपरूपक and his पाठ्य is our नाट्य or रूपक [22] The chief point of distinction between the two forms is that the उपरूपक had mainly to do with the bodily gestures and music, while both these occupied a secondary position in रूपक Thus उपरूपक would place greater emphasis on कायाभिनय, while रूपक would require सात्त्विक and other अभिनयs

To this distinction between रूपक and उपरूपक we shall have to revert later on just now it is sufficient to note these salient features of both the forms The above distinction brought out by KS is also borne out by other works BP, very clearly mentions (P 221) that रूपकs were रसात्मक and उपरूपकs were भावात्मक, also it calls (P 255) the उपरूपकs as नृत्यभेदा and रूपकs as नाट्यभेदा The distinction (P 181) that नाटक is वाक्यार्थाभिनयात्मक and नृत्य is पदार्थाभिनयात्मक also points to the same principle

After thus understanding the technical nature of रूपक and उपरूपक, it will now be easier to study their divisions in details Let us take up रूपक first

22 KS s गेयरूपक is termed नृत्यकाव्य by Abh It also uses the term गेयमानरूपक Of P 174 183

CHAPTER II

RŪPAKA

(Nāṭya and Rūpaka)

CHAPTER II

RŪPAKA

(Nātya and Rupaka)

THE word रूपक is to be derived from रूप् a root, the exact sense of which, in earlier literature, has not been as yet settled रूप, a substantive formed from this root, has been used in some of our early works According to Sten Konow[1], this word occuring in the fourth Rock Edict of अशोक, refers to a shadow device, which leads to the acceptance of the existence of shadow-plays in ancient India But Keith[2] takes रूप to mean visible representation De[3] supports him It seems that Keith is inclined to take this word in connection with puppet-play or Pantomime, which existed in India He thinks so, because in थेरगाथा[4] of the Buddhist cannon, the term रूपरूपकम् occurs and there, just before in the text, there is a mention of a puppet This sense may hold good in the case of the Fourth Rock Edict of अशोक as अशोक there, speaks of exhibiting spectacles of the dwellings of gods, of elephants and of bonfires This sense would be admirably suitable for the compound रूपदक्ख,[5] where it is obvious that some art is referred to That रूप in

1 San D P 54
2 San D P 54
3 IHQ Vol VII P 544
4 V, 394 (See San D P 54)
5 *Milindapanha* P 344

these earlier references, alludes to some sort of art of representation, seems definite enough from the very context, and there is every reason to believe that it referred to visible representation, as its later sense attests रूप in this sense, is used in NS, but only in the compound दशरूप, which occurs there five or six times[6] There are some more places where the word रूप is seen in NS,[7] but the sense applicable in every case is either 'form' or रूपाभास, or mere beauty These have no reference to our enquiry, in which रूप is to be taken as meaning visible representation but there is one term सरूप used in NS, some four or five times,[8] the sense of which is not easy to determine It may refer to some sort of special feature of dramatic representation, as it is used in connection with पुस्तक रूप also seems to have been used to designate some वाद्यविशेष in NS at one place[9] But these references do not lead us anywhere Only the definite term दशरूप bears testimony that रूप meant a dramatic representation, as early as NS

There is an interesting point in connection with this early sense of रूप् रूपयति and other forms of रूप्, when used in the stage directions, mean 'to

6 NS XVII, 133 XVIII 1, 4 184 XIX, 46 128 XXVII, 50 60

7 NS I 29, XIX 59 79, 122 XXI, 35 67 177, XXII 79 84

8 NS V 32 36 40 45 XXXI 213 329 also cf XXI, 67 and SR 7 1312

9 NS XXXI 320

act so as to represent visibly a particular situation or emotion' An analysis of our extant dramas shows that roots नट्, रूप् and अभि+नी and their forms like नाटितकेन, नाटयेन, नाटयति रूपयति रूपयित्वा etc, are used whenever such a stage-direction is intended All mean the same thing, but a careful investigation reveals the fact that रूप् is invariably used in earlier (i e earlier than DR) dramas, while an exclusive use of नाट् and अभि+नी is seen in all the later dramas With a view to ascertain this, I have collected evidence from all the dramas of note and following is the result

वररुचि's उभयाभिसारिका has no occasion for such a stage-direction I have examined प्रतिज्ञा प्रतिमा, स्वप्नवासवदत्ता, मध्यम, पञ्चरात्र and चारुदत्त of भास and have found that नाट् is used only twice, once in स्वप्न, and once in चारुदत्त while रूप् is not used at all in these plays कालिदास's dramas show a fair proportion of both these roots विक्रमोर्वशीयम् uses रूप् 10 times and नाट् 12 times In मालविकाग्निमित्रम्, रूप् and नाट् both are used 7 times In अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम्, both the roots are used 11 times निरूप्य in all the other dramas is used in the sense of 'closely observing' but in अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम्, it has been twice used in the sense of 'visibly representing', as in मदनबाणा निरूप्य[10] कौमुदीमहोत्सव, which seems to be a fairly early drama,[11] uses नाट् once and रूप् twice भगवदज्जुकम् has no such stage-direction In all the

10 अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम् Nir Press P 85 67, 93

11 See ABORI XII P 50ff The arguments advanced there are plausible

three dramas of हर्ष, नाट् only is used to the exclusion of रूप्, while in मत्तविलास of महेन्द्रविक्रम, a drama of the same age as हर्ष's, only रूप् is used In भवभूति, नाट् is usual, but उत्तररामचरित uses रूप् once in the V act आश्चर्यचूडामणि, a drama of this age, has used नाट only two times and रूप् 12 times मुद्राराक्षस has नाट only वेणीसंहार uses नाट् in most cases but has used रूप twice धूर्तविटसंवाद, which is certainly earlier than DR, uses रूप् once These are all the dramas admitted on all hands to have been composed before DR I have also examined a number of dramas composed after the time of DR, and they all show an exclusive use of नाट, with only one exception of the dubious पार्वतीपरिणयम्, which uses रूप् 4 times and नाट् 3 times Of the later dramas I have examined among others, all the available भाणs and प्रहसनs, पारिजातमञ्जरी, कौमुदीमित्रानन्द, कर्णसुन्दरी, विदग्धमाधव, पार्थपराक्रम, the six dramas of वत्सराज, उन्मत्तराघव, कुन्दमाला, सत्यहरिश्चन्द्र, प्रसन्नराघव रतिमन्मथ and कमलिनीकलहंस All these show नाट् only [12]

If this analysis means anything it seems certain that by the time of DR, रूप् as a root, was definitely superceded by नाट् Only the earlier dramas show रूप, not the later ones This has an interesting parallel in the usage of the word रूपक It is found that रूपक, as a generic term for drama, came into general prevalence only after DR's age The above analysis of the dramas also shows that

12 I have not examined dramas of very late dates (i e of 17th and 18th centuries) as their evidence is useless in such an enquiry

whereas almost all the dramas later than DR, use the generic term रूपक in their प्रस्तावनाs, the earlier dramas are, as if by conspiracy, silent about that word. Not one drama of a date earlier than DR has used this word[13] In the works on dramaturgy, again, NS *does not know the word* रूपक as a generic term for drama, but Abh knows it and अभिनव was almost a contemporary of धनञ्जय, if not later Earlier term for designating the dramatic genre was नाट्य and in some cases रूप (as in दशरूप in NS)

The result of this analysis puts a somewhat curious fact before us It seeme that नट् was the earlier root meaning 'to represent visibly' and नाट्य the earlier term meaning a drama In the course of evolution रूप् came in the field,[14] both as a root and as a substantive (रूप) The root रूप held sway side by side with नट् for nearly a thousand years and more and then dropped out and नट् survived, but रूप developed into रूपक, superceded नाट्य *and held field ever afterwards*

This shows that रूपक, as a generic term for drama came into vogue about the ninth or tenth century.

Let us now see the results of this whole discussion We have examined the terms नृत्त, नृत्य,

13 [illegible] uses रूपक and also both रूप् and नट् but as its date is a matter of uncertainty we may not attach any value to it

14 There is enough ground for the evolution of such a sense of the root

नाट्य and रूपक and following seem to be the senses attached to them

(a) नृत्त Dancing

(b) नृत्य Dancing+music+a little of acting. This is based on भावs

(c) नाट्य (a) + (b) + full histrionics This is based on रसs

(d) रूपक नाट्य + taking the role of some one else

To explain (a) A person experiences an emotion and not being able to control himself begins to exhibit the emotion by moving his limbs In so doing he has no consideration for others He jumps and moves i e dances just to satisfy himself irrespective of others around him This is नृत्त This art, therefore, is exclusively subjective नृत्त, therefore, can very well be illustrated by the random dancing of a child

(b) But soon one comes to realise that a particular movement of hand or foot or a particular movement of eye, lip, eye-brow etc, conveys a particular emotion to others Thus the random dancing comes to be regularised A dancer, experiencing joy himself wishes to show this to others, and dances in a particular manner, this shows to the other that the dancer feels joy This is नृत्य In this, an objective element creeps in The dancer has an eye to others who look at him He may, at times, take the help of music in expressing his emotions This

is supposed to be based on भावs, because the dancer as well as the spectator does not go beyond that stage Dancer experiences an emotion (भाव), and shows it by his dance and the spectator realises that भाव It seems that in नृत्य the spectator knows by the gestures of the नर्तकी that she experiences a particular emotion, but it is not essential that the spectator himself should experience the same emotion This art therefore, is based on भाव and is mostly subjective, being objective only partially

(c) But in नाट्य the dancer experiences an emotion and so interprets it in acting that even the spectator looses his identity and feels that emotion A नर्तकी, for instance, is dancing before a king and wishes to stimulate the feeling of love in him. She dances and acts in such a manner that the king's emotion of love is fully excited This is नाट्य Here the art is mostly objective, but only partially subjective, as the नर्तकी may not always feel the same emotion herself मालविका's चलित, referred to earlier, is of this type Various types of नाटकs described in works like NSD also, fall under this class

(d) So far we have concerned ourselves with one art only—that of expressing one's own emotion by some sort of visible representation Dance, music and histrionics–all would contribute to this end. But there is another art also A person knows that at the time of parting from

सीता, राम experienced highly tragic mood He wants to show to others the feelings experienced by राम He comes before them, dresses and acts in such a clever manner that the audience, for the time, loose themselves and experience the same emotion as represented by the actor This process, it will be seen, includes the whole of the नाट्य-process and adds to it the element of giving visibility to the part played by him by means of dress etc [15] Thus रूप, which as an art was originally distinct from नाट्य came to be combined with it रूप as a distinct art consisted in taking the form (role) of some one else, by means of the accessories like dress etc, and नाट्य was acting etc In what we call drama, both these came to be combined together and this new art was given the name of रूप and later on of रूपक Its distinction as रूपक was settled about the 9th or 10th century, earlier the drama was known by the terms नाटक, नाट्य or रूप In course of time रूपक became the generic term and नाटक a designation of an individual type

So, originally the art first designated by नृत्त and नृत्य and then culminating in the synthetic form of नाट्य was distinct from the art designated by the term रूप Later on both these were combined into a synthetic form But it should be noted that at this transitional stage, the usage of

15 This therefore is completely an objective art In it the actor has no personality of his own He imposes upon himself another personality and exhibits the same before the audience So both ways this art becomes objective

the terms cannot have been very rigid Therefore just as there is a possibility of confusion in the usage of नृत्य and नाट्य as shown earlier, there *is also a possibility of confusion in the usage of the* terms नाट्य and रूपक with reference to drama And we have shown above how and when these terms were finally distinguished from one another [15]

Thus we have fixed the nature and exact meanings of these terms But there were some other *terms* which had, *more or less*, a similar sense संगीतक[17], काव्य, प्रेक्षा, समाज and such other terms referred to the same art but emphasised one or the other element therein Thus, संगीतक would naturally have a predominence of music, काव्य of poetry and प्रेक्षा of visible elements समाज may refer to any assembly, but in the Ashokan edicts, it

16 The following definitions given by DR corrobora*es the above conclus ons

अवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्यं रूपं दृश्यतयोच्यते ।
रूपकं तत्समारोपात्

And all the la*er dramaturgis*s have copied down these defini*ions

17 It seems that earlier still, there was another term which designated some sort of drama*ic representation वररुचि's उभयाभिसारिका has this

कुसुमपुरपुरन्दरस्य भवने पुरन्दरविजयं नाम संगीतकं अभिनेतव्यम्

where the name पुरन्दरविजय and the ins*ruct on अभिनेतव्यम् make it possible that the term संगीतकम् also had a sense of drama*ic representation मृच्छकटिकम् also uses संगीतकम् in this sense in its प्रस्तावना cf. कामसूत्र too काव्य, too seems to have been used in the same sense cf NS—काव्यमङ्गमिते काव्ये XVIII, 106

seems to have been used to refer to some sort of spectacles But all these were loosely used and were mostly current in the transitional period नाट्य and रूपक were the only two terms which survived finally, रूपक gaining the ultimate ground as the generic term for 'Drama'

We can, now, take up a detailed study of the varieties of रूपक as recognised by our dramaturgists. I shall, in what follows, collect all the available data about the रूपकs with a view to ascertain their general nature and reserve for another section the discussion of such problems as would arise from such data

CHAPTER III

RŪPAKA (continued)

Types of Rūpaka

CHAPTER III

RŪPAKA (continued)

Types of Rupaka—general

IN this chapter, we propose to collect data from our dramaturgical works, first about the *number of species and then about the nature of* रूपक individually, adding, at the end of each variety, such remarks as may arise from the collected data, and reserving a comparative study of the growth of these individual types till the end of the chapter

Although all our known works on dramaturgy, more or less, follow भरत, a detailed study evinces certain differences of views it is, therefore, necessary to collect data from *all* the extant works In so doing, I shall proceed in strict chronological order, so that it will be easy to detect the *growth of the type* under consideration Remarks appended to the details of each type embody a careful sifting of the materials collected and put in clear terms the phases of the growth traceable in the different dramaturgical works

Number of Species

NS recognises नाटक, प्रकरण, अङ्क, व्यायोग, भाण, समवकार, वीथी, प्रहसन, डिम, ईहामृग, (XVIII, 2–3) But अङ्क is alternately named as उत्सृष्टिकाङ्क (XVIII, 8) Further on नाटी is called a mixture of नाटक and प्रकरण (XVIII, 106)

AP has these same types but it also enumerates seventeen types of उपरूपक in the same list, without designating them as such, but including all the 27 (10+17) types under the general head नाटक (338, 1—4)

DR (I, 11) has the same ten varieties, including नाटिका under नाटक भरत's नाटी has, here, developed into नाटिका

KS (P 317) notes 12 रूपकs with the addition of नाटिका and सट्टक to the usual list

ND enumerates 12 रूपकs, including नाटिका and प्रकरणी under रूपकs and adding the following note

नाटकप्रकरणयोः प्राधान्यमाह। अङ्क इति उत्सृष्टिकाङ्को न पुनरवस्था-सामान्यादिरूप। (P 26)

But in his treatment of नाटिका (P 121–122) and प्रकरणी (P 123), a trend, to consider them as sub varieties of नाटक and प्रकरण is clearly visible, and distinctly enough it enumerates twelve types Of course नाटक and प्रकरण are called predominent (P 26)

BP also follows NS in the ten varieties, pointing out, however, *the predominence of नाटक* (P 221) It takes नाटिका as an admixture of नाटक and प्रकरण

RS has the same ten varieties as NS (III,3), but it expressly notes that नाटक is the basis of all the other varieties thus

आहु प्रकरणादीनां नाटकं प्रकृतिं बुधा
अतिदेशबलप्राप्तनाटकाङ्गोपजीवनात्
अन्यानि रूपकाणि स्युर्विकारा नाटकं प्रति।

PR does not note नाटिका

SD has the same ten types and takes नाटिका as an उपरूपक.

MMC notes that some include नाटिका and प्रकरणी under उपरूपक (P 73), which may refer to the SD school

भगवदज्जुकम्, a प्रहसन, has the following

अत्र तु नाटकप्रकरणोद्भवासु वारहामृगडिमसमवकारव्यायोगभाणसमवकार-वीथीउत्सृष्टिकाङ्कप्रहसनादिषु दशजातिषु (P 3)

Remarks

This last evidently refers to a distinct principle of division, for नाटक and प्रकरण are here, taken as the basis of the other ten types, while according to the usual theory as seen above they themselves form the first two types Out of these ten types, again, लास्य and वार are not seen in the list of the main रूपकs anywhere, though लास्य occurs as an उपरूपक About वार, which is not found anywhere as a रूपकप्रकार Prof K H Dhruva suggests as follows (in a letter to me) "The word नाट्यवार is used in भावप्रकाशनम् वासवदत्तानाट्यवार occurs as the name of a drama in ND Abh. speaks of वासवदत्ता-नाट्यधारा as a composition of सुबन्धु This नाट्यधारा of सुबन्धु is alluded to in the beginning of दण्डी's अवन्ती-सुन्दरीकथा हेमाचार्य calls सुबन्धु to have been a minister of चन्द्रगुप्तमौर्य and बिन्दुसार Abh (on 18, 1) has अनया आर्यया चन्द्रगुप्तबिन्दुसारादेर्नाऽपि सूच्यन्ते इति, and it refers to this नाट्यधारा In both the words—नाट्यधारा and नाट्यवार—नाट्य is equivalent to 'act' Therefore नाट्यवार means 'collection of acts', and नाट्यधारा means 'series of

acts' Thus नाट्यगार and नाट्यवारा are synonyms of नाटक They were used at about the 4th century B C, if not earlier To use the एकशेष वार as seen in भगवद॰ is improper" However वार here *is* taken as a type of drama and it is not in accordance with NS

Moreover these ten varieties of भगवद॰, again, would yield 12 types, if taken along with नाटक and प्रकरण which are, here, taken as the basis of the other varieties This may, then, seem to preserve the same tradition as KS and ND school But from the above analysis, it will be seen that whereas KS and ND substantially agree with the theory of ten रूपकs (though by including one of the sub-varieties, they preserve the tradition of 12 रूपकs), भगवदज्जुकम् is quite alone in its enumeration of the 12 रूपकs, as it takes नाटक and प्रकरण as the basis of other species, which shows that it followed a tradition quite distinct from that of NS

This statement of भगवदज्जुकम् takes नाटक and प्रकरण as two generic terms We have got some other references, too, which treat these two as the generic terms for drama अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम् uses both नाटक and प्रकरण in its प्रस्तावना in distinct senses When the सूत्रधार asks अथ कतमत्प्रकरणमाश्रित्य , he, as if it were, suggests that प्रकरण was equivalent to the later रूपक, while कतमत् may probably refer to the fact that there were some varieties of प्रकरण And then the सूत्रधार replies that he was

going to perform a new नाटक etc, which would mean that नाटक was a variety of प्रकरण There is another fact which we have already pointed out that रूपक as a generic term for drama, came into prevalence only in DR's time Earlier dramas either do not use any generic term or use the word नाटक in their प्रस्तावनाs शूद्रक's पद्मप्राभृतकम्, a भाण recently brought to light, twice refers to a कुमुद्वती-प्रकरण At P 23, there is a passage as follows

कुमुद्वतीभूमिकाप्रकरणपात्रमुपनय (probably to be emended as कुमुद्वतीप्रकरणभूमिका)

and at P 25 the following is seen

किमिदं तालपत्रेऽभिलिखितम् । किं ब्रवीषि—नाटकभूमिका इति । (गृहीत्वा वाचयति) कुमुद्वतीप्रकरणे शूर्पकासक्ता राजदारिका धात्री रहस्युपालभते।

Here, too, प्रकरण and नाटक seem to have been used in a generic sense, though प्रकरण, here, may well be the type known to NS as the low taste of the princess indicates but नाटक is certainly used in a generic sense भास in his प्रतिज्ञा uses प्रकरण in a generic sense सूत्रधार in the प्रस्तावना says·

तनस्तत्र गीतप्रसादिते रङ्गे वयमपि प्रकरणमारभामहे ।

This word प्रकरण cannot be taken in its usual technical sense here (as has been wrongly done by Keith) as we shall make clear further

These few but decisive statements are enough to prove that both नाटक and प्रकरण were taken as generic terms at some time or other

With this conclusion, well accords the fect that AP takes नाटक as a generic term, for it desig-

nates the 328th chapter as नाटकनिरूपणम् ND, too, considers नाटक and प्रकरण as the predominent types With this concur the views of BP and RS

But this (particularly RS) may lead us to believe that other types had sprung up from नाटक And that would be a very important question, for it may be taken to mean that other types were non-existent at first and came into being only very late, after the नाटक type had perfected That this view cannot be sound we shall see later, when we shall discuss the question in details

Types of Rupaka—individual

1. नाटक

Def ND defines it thus (P 28)

नाटकमिति नाटयति विचित्र रञ्जनाप्रवेशेन सभ्याना हृदय नर्तयतीति नाटकम्। अभिनवगुप्तस्तु रमनार्थस्यापि नटेर्नाटकशब्दं व्युत्पादयति तत्र तु घटादित्वेन ह्रस्वाभावश्चिन्त्य । यद्यपि कथादयोऽपि श्रोतृहृदय नाटयन्ति तथाप्यङ्गोपायादीना वैचित्र्यहेतूनामभावात् न तथा रञ्जकत्वमिति न ते नाटकम्। तथा नाटक प्रधानपुरुषार्थेषु राज्ञा तदङ्गभूतेष्वमात्यादीना च बहूना व्युत्पादकमिति कतिपयव्युत्पादकानि प्रकरणादीन्यपि न नाटकमिति ।

NS (XVIII, 10-91)

Hero Renowned

Plot Renowned (It should be noted here that by 'renowned' our theorists mean a plot that is taken from any work which is famous in the author's own times, such as रामायण, महाभारत, बृहत्कथा etc) It may depict the life incidents of a king or it may have a divine hero It should have grandeur, luxury, and prosperity of every kind, various, रस and भाव,

resulting from joy and sorrow.

Act Def अङ्क is so called because, in it the incidents rise gradually into भाव and रस. (14)

Keeping in mind the whole action, one should make an act (i e the first act) upto the extension of बिन्दु The first act should complete one thread, बीज and should slightly commence बिन्दु There may figure the king, queen, servants, family-priest, minister and merchants and it should not have only one रस. Anger, negligence, grief, curse, disturbance, marriage, and marvellous scenes should be represented directly, while battle, deposition of a king, death, besieging a town should not be directly represented, but suggested by प्रवेशक, etc Hero should never be killed Duration of the action in an act, must last only for one day Many threads of the plot may be woven in one act, provided these do not hamper the necessary progress of the action At the end of an act, all the characters should make their exit Knowing the divisions of the day, one should arrange the various actions in an act If an incident is not completed at the end of the day act should be completed all the same, and the remaining portion should be suggested by means of प्रवेशक, etc Hero should be present in the act but a प्रवेशक, is full of conversation between servants There may be five to ten acts प्रवेशक may occur between any two acts, in order to effect the necessary abridgement of the story, having neither high nor middle characters, nor

noble speech, but only Prakrits After the break of an act, action with one month's or one year's (but in no case, with more than one year's) duration may be suggested (in a प्रवेशक) If a character goes on a long journey, the act should be completed then

DR (3, 1–43)

When सूत्रधार retires another actor – स्थापक – should enter and introduce the drama He should suggest the plot, बीज and one of the characters and pleasing the audience with sweet verses, he should describe a season, resorting to भारती वृत्ति In this introductory scene, he may employ the वीथ्यङ्ग with profit

In आमुख, the सूत्रधार may converse with नटी or मारिष or विदूषक on a subject pertaining to himself, hinting at the plot Of this (आमुख or प्रस्तावना) there are three forms (1) opening of the story (कथोद्घात), (2) the entrance of a character (प्रवृत्तक) and (3) the particular presentation (प्रयोगातिशय) कथोद्घात is that in which a character enters taking up the remark of the सूत्रधार or the sense thereof Thus it is of two kinds प्रवृत्तक is one, in which a person is hinted at by the resemblence of some season प्रयोगातिशय is one, in which a character enters in accordance with a reference by the सूत्रधार by the words 'Here he is'

Hero must be full of noble qualities, धीरोदात्त, powerful, desirous of fame, highly energetic, preserver *of the Vedas, of a famous descent,* king or a divine person

Plot The dramatist should select his plot from इतिहास etc , and whatever in the original story is incompatible with the hero or रस, should be abandoned or fashioned otherwise and deciding beforehand what to give up, he should bring into play the acceptable and disregard the rest

The body of the plot should be divided into बीज, बिन्दु etc , (the five अवस्थाs), into मुख etc , (the five सन्धिs), and into five अर्थप्रकृतिs with their subdivisions and अनुसन्धिs (The पताका incident should be void of सन्ध्यङ्गs, so too, the प्रकरी should be without सन्धिs) Thus dividing the body, he may arrange a विष्कम्भक or an act directly as it suits his purpose विष्कम्भक may just follow प्रस्तावना but whenever the plot is interesting from the beginnig, it should open with an act directly, following the आमुख

Main रस all throughout, should be nourished by भाव, विभाव, अनुभाव, सात्त्विक and व्यभिचारि and should never be overclouded by other रसs nor should the excessive रस cloud the plot or नाट्यालङ्कार

Long journey, death, battle, revolution of kingdoms, siege, eating, bath, sexual intercourse, besmearing the body and putting on clothes should never be shown directly So, too, the death of the hero should never happen and yet whatever is necessary should not be given up

KS (P 317) points out that 'दिव्याश्रयोपेतम्' in NS, refers to a hero having some divine help, but does not mean a divine hero Thus there

must be only mortal heroes in a नाटक Heroine, however, may be divine e g उर्वशी

Mainly शृंगार or वीर should be predominent Plot must be famous but slightly imaginary too

SD (P 274) notes that the hero may be a क्षत्रिय i e not necessarily a king

BP (P. 224 ff) Referring to the element of imaginary portion in the plot of a नाटक, it is here remarked that even मातृगुप्त allows (भावित) it In रामानन्द, a drama, the description of विभीषण, even before सीता's capture, is imaginary

It is noted that even कोहल requires पताकास्थानs and at the close of the बीज, the commencement of बिन्दु in the first act

नाटक should have नान्दी and प्रस्तावना चित्रावलि* has an act, having action co-extensive with one day but there may be an act within the space of half a day as in गौरीगृह *

It is stated that सुबन्धु divides नाटक into पूर्ण, प्रशान्त, भास्वर, ललित and समग्र पूर्ण may have all the five संधिs e g कृत्यारावण प्रशान्त should have प्रशान्त रस prominent It should have the following संधिs न्यास, न्याससमुद्भेद, बीजोक्ति, बीजदर्शन and अनुदिष्टसंहार It should have सात्वती style, so द्रौहिणी e g स्वप्नवासवदत्ता In it, when the queen, under calamity, being taken away from the king is placed in the hands of मागधिका, मुखसंधि called न्यास occurs प्रतिमुख of न्यास is called

*Prof K H Dhruva suggests that these may be the titles of the first acts of उत्तरराम० and मालती० respectively

सन्निवेद e g seeing पद्मावती's beautiful face decorated with विशेषक, the king knew that अवन्तिका was still living वीजोक्ति happens when the king through anxiety cries out 'एहि वासवदत्त क्व क्व यासि।' वीजदर्शन occurs in searching for the other, on seeing one out of the two objects which were always associated, by sight or touch e g

> चिरप्रसुप्त कामो मे वीणया प्रतिबोधित ।
> तां तु देवीं न पश्यामि यस्या घोषवती प्रिया ।

And when the words – किं त भूप त्रिय कृयाम् – are not used, it is called by भरत and others, अनुदिष्टसंहार

In भास्वर type, again, there may be the following सन्धि माला, नायकसिद्धि, अङ्गग्लानि वस्या परिक्षेप and मात्रावशिष्टसंहार When the नायक and प्रतिनायक are both renowned, मालासंधि is caused e g चन्द्रगुप्त and नन्दन When another man achieves the desired object by deceiving the नायक (? प्रतिनायक), there happens नायकसिद्धि e g रावण was deceived by मारीच ग्लानि happens when विमर्द etc are seen e g besieging of लङ्का by the वानरs after crossing the ocean परिक्षेप happens when the hero is overpowered by the enemies' forces e g रामलक्ष्मण being tied up by नागपाश मात्रावशिष्टसंहार happens when after killing the enemy, the females captured by him, are tested e g सीता's ordeal after रावण's death. This भास्वर type may be full of भारती style and heroic and अद्भुत रसs e. g बालरामायण

ललित may have कैशिकी style and erotic रस e g ऊर्वशीविप्रलम्भ It will have the following five सन्धि – विलास, विप्रलम्भ, विप्रयोग, विशोधन and उद्दिष्टोपसंहृति. विलास happens when the hero and others enjoy according to

seasons e g वत्सराज's enjoying of वसन्तोत्सव विप्रलम्भ is separation of lovers by jealousy or by will e g वत्सराज's separation from वासवदत्ता विप्रयोग, (the text has विप्रलम्भ once more, but it is incorrect) is that separation between lovers which is caused by curses etc e g ययाति's separation from शर्मिष्ठा विशोधन is purification of faults on account of fear of scandal e g सीता's by राम उद्दिष्टार्थोपसहृति – as in विक्रमोर्वशीय – the message of इन्द्र 'May उर्वशी live with you long, being your wife'

समग्र type will have all the वृत्तिs and all the characteristics and is represented by महानाटक

उपक्षेप, परिहार, परिन्यास, विलोभन – these elements should be present in all the types, युक्ति, प्राप्ति, समाधान, विधान, and परिभावना should be present in the प्रशान्त type only and अज्ञापवाद, सफेट, प्रमद्र, विद्रव and सम्भ्रम with their sub-divisions should be present in भास्वर type, while विरोध, प्रणय, पर्युपासन, पुष्प and वज्र should necessarily be woven in the ललित type

But a नाटक in which various elements of all the types are seen, is called समाचार and it has been called समग्र

SD (VI, 7 ff) Acts must be arranged after the fashion of गोपुच्छ This has been taken by some to mean that the acts should be made gradually shorter (क्रमेणाङ्का सूक्ष्म कर्तव्य) while others say 'Just as in the tail of a cow some hair is short and some long, so too, some complete threads should be woven in मुखसंधि and others in प्रतिमुखसंधि and so on'

There may be a गर्भाङ्क, which should occur in the bulk of an act, having रङ्गद्वार, आमुख, बीज, फल e g in बालरामायण the गर्भाङ्क called सीतास्वयंवर

Remarks

It will be seen that all the theorists follow implicitly the outlines of the technique as detailed by NS, making only very minor changes In spite of the details seen in DR or BP or ND which are not found in NS, it will be at once noted that these later texts merely elaborated upon the materials found in NS, never showing a fundamental departure from the principles recognised therein Even कोहल and others, when quoted, show themselves in general agreement with NS SD perhaps stands alone in recognising the गर्भाङ्क, though as early a drama as प्रियदर्शिका uses this device MTR would, at first, seem to hold a distinct view when he allows an imaginary admixture in plot, but, most probably it only means, as seen in DR, that the poet had certain liberty of making adjustments in the original story

But सुबन्धु, as quoted by शारदातनय, seems to preserve some distinct tradition, probably unknown to NS or at least not recognised therein The five types of dramas as detailed by सुबन्धु, show a fairly elaborate development in dramaturgical technique as well as in practice

2 प्रकरण

NS (XVIII, 93–105) Plot should be imaginary and all that is said about the body of the

drama etc, under नाटक, should be applied to प्रकरण, too Life-story of a ब्राह्मण or a minister or a merchant or a priest or an अमात्य or a सार्थवाह is woven in it There should be no उदात्त hero, no divine element, no kingly luxury It should have all the बाह्यजनs, having दास, विट, श्रेष्ठि, also more of वेश्या and less of कुलस्त्री, but where there is a story of a सचिव, ब्राह्मण, पुरोहित श्रेष्ठि, अमात्य or सार्थवाह, there should be no वेश्या and if at all there is a वेश्या, there should be no कुलजा

There may be five to ten acts

DR (3, 44-45) Hero should be either an अमात्य or a विप्र or a वणिक् he should be धीरप्रशान्त in nature, fallen on bad days and ready to do a good turn Heroine may be a कुलजा, वेश्या or both The former must always stay in the inner apartments and the latter outside and they should not cross one another प्रकरण is threefold according as the heroine is कुल्जा, वेश्या, or both

Examples DR (avaloka) वेश्या alone – तरङ्गदत्ता, कुलजा alone – पुष्पदूषितकम्, both – मृच्छकटिकम्

ND (P 177 ff) notes that the hero may be धीरोदात्त or धीरप्रशान्त and remarks

यस्त्वमात्य नेतारमभ्युपगम्य धीरप्रशान्तनायकमिति प्रकरणे विशेषयति स वृद्धसम्प्रदायवन्ध्य । यदाहु –सेनापतिरमात्यश्च धीरोदात्तौ प्रकीर्तितौ – इति ।

The heroine may be low-born and hence appopriately the hero too, may be low-born ND argues that if in this case, the hero is high-born the incident in the drama पुष्पदूषितकम्, wherein the mother-in-law, in the absence of her son, aban-

dons her daughter-in-law and the abandoned daughter-in-law stays at the house of शकसेन, would be improper So also, when the heroine is a वेश्या, even immodest manners may be allowed e g in विशाखदत्त's देवीचन्द्रगुप्तम् the utterance of कुमारचन्द्रगुप्त with reference to माधवसेना

> आनन्दाश्रुजलं सितोत्पलरुचोराबध्नता नेत्रयो
> प्राप्तेषु वसन्ते पुलकिषु स्वैरं समालम्बते ।
> कुर्वन्ति नितम्बयोरुपनयं सम्भावितारोप्यसौ
> केनाप्यस्मि कान्तोऽयं निरम्बनरक्तैरस्मिन्वीरामृतवासित ॥

ND divides प्रकरण into seven types (which are also seen in KS) according as the hero or the result or the plot is imaginary 1 Hero is imaginary and the other two famous 2 Result is imaginary, 3 Plot is imaginary, 4 Hero and result are imaginary, 5 Hero and plot are imaginary, 6 Result and plot are imaginary and 7. All the three are imaginary. (N B whatever is not imaginary may be taken from some earlier poet or from stories like महाभारत) Then again, the heroine may be कुलजा, वेश्या, or both and thus the above seven types will yield 21 types These, again, are pure if there is कुलजा or वेश्या only or mixed if there are both Thus pure=14, mixed=7

Here, too, it is pointed out that if the plot refers to a householder, there may be a कुलजा, as in पुष्पदूषितक and if otherwise, a वेश्या only, as in तरङ्गदत्ता and if the hero is a विट like शूद्रक (पद्मप्राभृतकम् ?), both, but वेश्या, in the last case should be the chief heroine

It wants the absence of the abundance of कैशिकी and points out that the fact that मालतीमाधव shows an abundance of कैशिकी, militates against वृद्धाभिप्राय

BP (P 241) notes that कुलजा should use Sanskrit and वेश्या Prakrit

SP enjoins only pure विष्कम्भक in a प्रकरण It says that विट, शकार, कुट्टिनी etc, चेट and others should always be there

Examples पद्मावतीपरिणय has विप्रचरित, मृच्छकटिक has वाणिजम् चरितम्, मालतीमाधव has कुलस्त्री, तरङ्गदत्ता has गणिका and मृच्छकटिक has both SD takes मृच्छकटिक to have विप्र-नायक, मालतीमाधव to have अमात्यनायक and पुष्पदूषितक to have a वणिक् hero

RS divides a प्रकरण into शुद्ध, धूर्त, and मिश्र मालतीमाधव having कुलस्त्री is शुद्ध, कामदत्ता having गणिका is धूर्त and मृच्छकटिक having both is मिश्र

Remarks

मृच्छकटिक The hero is a ब्राह्मण and yet both the कुलजा and वेश्या are seen in this drama which militates against the express injunction of NS, ND and others DR has this drama in view when it enjoins कुलजा to remain in the inner apartments and वेश्या outside The plot of the drama is imaginary except perhaps the last incident of आर्यक's revolt, which seems to have its basis in historical facts BP's injunction that कुलजा should speak in Sanskrit is not followed here

No element in मालतीमाधव goes against the theory as detailed above, though it has no विदूषक or विट

and others, but these were evidently out of place in a डिम type (according to ND) It should be noted that, here, too, नान्दी resorts to Prakrit.

Keith considers भास's प्रतिज्ञा to be a प्रकरण (San D P 102), which as we have already pointed out is incorrect It seems that he has been led away by the word प्रकरण in the प्रस्तावना, but there the term प्रकरण is used in a generic sense Not a single essential condition of प्रकरण is fulfilled by प्रतिज्ञा

3 समवकार

Def DR (avaloka) समवकीर्यन्तेऽस्मिन्नर्था इति समवकारः।

NS (XVIII, 109–122) It should start with देवासुरs having famous and noble hero An act may have 3 कपटs (frauds), 3 विद्रवs (disturbances) and 3 शृङ्गारs, having 12 heroes and a duration of 18 नाडिकाs Every act must have कपट, विद्रव, प्रहसन, वीथी First Act may have 12 नाडिकाs, second four and third two, which completes the action One नाडिका is equal to ½ मुहूर्त

As to the subject-matter, विद्रव may be threefold according as it is caused by (1) siege (2) fight or water (3) fire or elephant कपट may be threefold according as it is caused by (1) fate (2) enemy (3) happiness or misery. शृङ्गार may be threefold according as it is caused by धर्म, अर्थ and काम, which would be the respective aims of life.

उष्णिह् अनुष्टुभ् and the difficult metres (उष्णिगनुष्टुभ्भ्यां वृत्तानि च यानि बन्धकुटिलानि) should be used in this type

DR (3,61) सधि except विमर्श वृत्ति मन्दकैशिकी वीथ्यङ्ग may be used profitably Plot famous, describing देवासुर Heroes gods and demons, 12 रस वीर prominent Acts 3, First act may have two सधिs

KS (P 320) Plot It must contain gods and demons, the subject-matter being imaginary or famous कपट may be caused (1) when one guiltless is deceived by another (2) when the deceived one is also guilty (3) when both are not guilty, but deceit is caused accidentally According to some, there must be heroes and counter-heroes in each act An adjustment in the number of the heroes is allowed

ND (P 124) रस वीर and रौद्र. With regard to the division of the duration in each act it is noted

एके तु प्रत्यङ्कं यथोदितद्विगुण कालमानमाहु ।

Metre स्रग्धरा etc , not गायत्री etc , but some allow गायत्री etc.

BP (P 248–250) notes that the first act should have the first two सधिs, second the first three सधिs and the third the four सधिs except विमर्श

Three varieties of शृगार are thus explained (1) when erotic is resorted to only for procreating a son, otherwise practising vows etc , it is धर्मशृगार (2) when erotic is indulged in for getting money, it is अर्थशृगार and (3) when it is indulged in the company of another's wife, gambling, wine etc , it is कामशृगार

SD follows BP in the matter of सधिs in each act

RS illustrates धर्मशृंगार by पार्वतीपरमेश्वर's love
Examples BP and others अमृतमन्थन RS पयोधिमन्थन.
Remarks

There is one point in the above theory that draws our attention at once. भरत wants उष्णिह् and other difficult metres for this type ND, later as it is, wants स्रग्धरा and others pointing out at the same time that some allowed गायत्री etc ND, thus, allows only the classical metres, not the Vedic ones Obvious inference from this would be that NS had in view some specimens which actually used उष्णिह् or other difficult Vedic metres. Does it refer to an earlier age when these Vedic metres were actually in vogue and therefore natural ? NS mentions that a समवकार was performed before gods It, at least, supports the above suggestion

The injunction in BP and SD, according to which each act should have सन्धि commencing from मुखसन्धि is difficult to explain. *Does it refer to* three distinct incidents to be commenced and developed in each of these three acts and finally to bring about a connection and a fitting end of all these three ? Compare in this connection ND (P 39) While discussing प्रवेशक etc , it is noted that they should not be employed even in समवकार.

वड्क्षेन्ते समवकारस्य परस्परासम्बद्धाङ्कानुसरता तु . .etc
This distinctly states that in समवकार acts were not connected with one another

Keith considers पञ्चरात्र of भास, (out of the earlier

dramas) to make the nearest approach to समवकार but it should be remembered that in समवकार, story of gods and demons is essential, and that though in पञ्चरात्र, fraud is seen in the first act and disturbance in all the three, no शृंगार is seen all throughout the drama At the same time it is noteworthy that भास, who otherwise uses simple verses, has used many difficult classical verses in this drama

It will be seen that समवकार, डिम, and व्यायोग are all alike, more or less, and पञ्चरात्र exhibits all the characteristics of व्यायोग as described by NS, DR and BP, except that it has three acts and difficult verses, which, however, would be quite natural in a type which essentaily represents haughty रस. May this not suggest a transitional stage ?

4. डिम

Def DR (avaloka) because it involves the procedure of injuring on the part of the hero – डिम being equivalent to संघात 'injuring', KS notes that डिम, डिम्ब and विद्रव are synonymous, and because विद्रव is present here, it is called डिम

NS (XVIII, 129–134) Plot renowned, Hero 16, renowned and उदात्त Acts 4 रसs Except erotic and humourous, all the haughty रसs वृत्ति सात्वती and आरभटी There may be fight, tugging, magical illusion, many males, gods, serpants, राक्षसs, यक्षs, and cyclonic accidents

DR (3, 59) वृत्ति except कैशिकी संधि 4,, void of विमर्श

Examples BP. ब्नोद्रग, नाटोद्राण SD NS DR त्रिपुरदाह RS वीरभद्रविजृम्भण्

5 ईहामृग

Def DR avaloka) This kind of drama is called ईहामृग because in it the hero pursues (ईहते) a woman as unattainable as a gazelle (मृग) KS ईहा चेष्टा मृगस्येव स्त्रीमात्रार्था यत्र

NS (XVIII, 124-128) Plot A divine hero and a divine lady Haughty males, becoming angry for the sake of a lady, causing संक्षोभ, सन्देह शृङ्गार may be caused by the capture of the heroine Whatever heroes, रस, वृत्ति are in व्यायोग, the same should be here, only here the union of the hero with the heroine should be effected

DR (3,64) Plot: mixed सन्धि 3 नायक and प्रतिनायक my be divine or human, both being famous, धीरोद्धत and the latter may loose his end by improper acts A semblence of love on the part of the one who tries to obtain divine woman against her will by capture etc , may be presented

KS (P 322) first quotes the NS passage wherein the following occurs

ईहामृगस्तु कार्य सुसमाहितकाव्यबन्धश्च ।
व्यायोगो कार्य

and then comments upon it thus

कार्यस्तत्रैकाङ्क उच्यते । तेन एक एवाङ्क ।

It, thus, allows only one act and twelve heroes

ND (P 131) wants वीथ्यङ्ग Acts 1 or 4 Quarrel should be caused by a divine woman If it has one act, the action must last for one day only, if four, for four days,

SD Acts 1 or 4

Examples BP कुसुमशेखर, RS · मायाकुरङ्ग, SD कुसुमशेखरविजय

Remarks

NS notes only one point of difference between व्यायोग and ईहामृग, by saying that in the latter the union with the heroine should be effected, which would naturally suggest that in व्यायोग the union should not be effected How, then, shall we classify मध्यम of भास as a व्यायोग, in which union with the heroine is effected ?

6. व्यायोग or व्यायाम

Def DR(avaloka) because in it men disagree with one another (व्यायुज्यन्ते)

NS (XVIII, 135-137) Plot renowned Hero renowned Act one Many males fight there as in समवकार, but the number may not be the same i e 12 Hero may be divine or a king There must be various kinds of fighting and it should be full of haughty रस

DR (3, 60) Hero ख्यातोद्धत संधि void of गर्भ and विमर्श Plot Fighting not caused by a woman as in the case of जामदग्न्यजय Action must last for one day only

KS (P 323) notes that it is like a sequal (शेषभूत) to डिम By 'few females' he takes it to be void of heroine etc, but allows maids to be present It is once called व्यायाम here

BP (P 248) Hero धीरोद्धत There may be 3,4 or 5 but never more than ten heroes It should have a विष्कम्भक. वृत्ति भारती and आरभटी

Examples DR and ND· जामदग्न्यजय RS धनञ्जयजय SD, सौगन्धिकाहरण N B one सौगन्धिकाहरण published by Nirnaya Sagar Press is a प्रेक्षणक and not a व्यायोग It, therefore, seems that there were two dramas of the same name

Remarks

That मध्यम of भास should not be taken as a व्यायोग has been already suggested by us under ईहामृग Very close relations between समवकार, ईहामृग, डिम and व्यायोग are apparent from the theory

7. अङ्क or उत्सृष्टिकाङ्क

Def DR(avaloka) It is called उत्सृष्टिकाङ्क (instead of merely अङ्क) for the purpose of distinguishing it from the अङ्क (act) included in a play KS (P 324): one which is characterised by women who are grieving i e whose sight, life and breath are about to flee away (उत्क्रमोन्मुखा सृष्टिर्जीवित प्राणा यासां ता उत्सृष्टिका शोचन्त्य स्त्रियस्ताभिरङ्कित इति तथोक्त) ND quotes KS

NS (XVIII, 138-145) Plot renowned but rarely imaginary Heroes ordinary persons, not divine रस करुण (chief) No fight etc, and full of the wailings of women वृत्ति भारती

NS has a note that whenever a fight of a divine hero is represented, it should be so done in भारतवर्ष, for all the land therein is charming, fragrant and golden there is constant joy in the form of love-sports of ladies in garden etc (I think that this does not refer to अङ्क only but to all the forms of drama, otherwise the condition about the divine hero would directly militate against the above injunction that there should be no divine hero in an अङ्क)

DR (3, 63) has a note that there may be युद्ध as well as victory and defeat by speech only

ND (P 130 ff) Act 1, as the action must be over in one day

BP (P 251) वृत्ति सात्वती and आरभटी Act one according to Bharata, two according to कोहल and three according to व्यासाञ्जनेयगुरु सन्धि मुख and निर्वहण according to कोहल Here is a note that usually death should not be represented on the stage, but if the dead one is going to be revived, it may be allowed Revival is illustrated as follows In रामानुजाङ्कय of लक्ष्मणमेन, in नागानन्द, of जीमूतवाहन, moreover death of mortals by divine persons, (as of the sons of सगर by कपिल as in गङ्गाभगीरथ) should be suggested in प्रवेशक (thus explains शङ्क the word 'भारतवर्षे' in NS)

Examples SD शर्मिष्ठाययाति, RS करुणकुण्डला

8 प्रहसन

NSj (XVIII, 146-150) It is divided into two kinds – शुद्ध and सङ्कीर्ण It (शुद्ध) should be arranged with humourous speeches of भगवन्, तापस, विप्र and

others, having कापुरुषः thus it should be full of humourous speeches, having no विकृत language, poems full of भाव etc, with the plot moving on to a fixed goal संकीर्ण has hataerae, servants, eunuchs parasites deceitful persons and बन्धकी and is full of coarse dress, gesture etc

Popular story or a story full of दम्भ may be woven in a प्रहसन, having धूर्तोक्तिविवाद It may have वीथ्यङ्गs.

DR (3,55–58) divides it into three kinds as – शुद्ध, विकृत and संकीर्ण शुद्ध is the same as in NS विकृत is संकीर्ण of NS and संकीर्ण, here, is accepted as a distinct kind as it has वीथ्यङ्गs रस sixfold हास्य

KS (P 324) explains the अविकृतभाषाचार of NS as not being विकृत i e असभ्य and अश्लील

ND (P 128) notes that it should have सन्धि, वृत्ति and act as in भाण

SD allows संकीर्ण to have two acts

RS says that it should have the following ten elements (which are not the वीथ्यङ्गs as given by others) अवलगित, अवस्कन्द, व्यवहार, विप्रलम्भ, उपपत्ति, भय, अनृत, विभ्रान्ति, गद्गदवाक् and प्रलाप Each one of these is defined and illustrated.

Examples BP सैरन्ध्रिका – संकीर्ण, सागरकौमुदी – शुद्ध and कलिकेलि – विकृत, SD कन्दर्पकेलि – शुद्ध, धूर्तचरित – संकीर्ण and लटकमेलक – संकीर्ण with two acts. RS आनन्दकोश

Remarks:

NS requires भगवत् etc, in the शुद्ध type: now भगवत् is a very unusual term in [this connection.

Can it refer to any actual प्रहसन which had a भगवत् as a character, as in भगवदज्जुकम्, or does it refer to that play itself ?

दामकप्रहसन This is a peculiar piece arranged much after the fashion of धनञ्जयविजय, with which it shares the feature of wholesale borrowings from various writers The piece itself i e the main incident about दामक, covers only three printed pages Two more pieces, as short as half a printed page each, are appended to the first one Last two pieces present no हास्य In the first piece, दामक is a genuine imitation of a विदूषक as in स्वप्नवासवदत्तम् and others

No one can seriously call this a प्रहसन Of course, it opens with all the *eclat* of a प्रस्तावना, but the rest is merely reminiscent of the dialogues and monologues in our present-day school-gatherings Might not these three pieces have served the same purpose in an assembly of some king, *just to divert him ?* In that case, this play must have been enacted, at a time, not very remote from the composition of भास-dramas, for otherwise, many of the humourous hits contained herein, would have been lost upon the audience As a matter of fact, the हास्य in this small piece is evoked only by the conscious imitation of the funny expressions seen in the dramas of भास and others, and much of it would, certainly, be lost upon an audience which was not well-conversant with those dramas

If this drama was ever treated as a प्रहसन, it

must have been in very ancient days indeed, as its technique is simplicity itself It is completely written in Sanskrit, which may classify it as a [illegible] type No extant theorist presupposes such a specimen, and no recent dramatist, after the strong conventions created by these theorists, would even dream of composing such a piece

Most certainly it is not the 14th drama of भास, as Mr Ramakrṣṇa Kavi suggests its very nature precludes it from being designated as an independent drama It is merely a selection of scenes or half-scenes from various dramas for the diversion of some patron

नाटचाटप्रहसन This, too, may not be considered as a representative specimen of the प्रहसन as detailed by our theorists It divides itself into two संधि, instead of acts The incidents narrated in both these are absolutely unconnected with one another, and though one or two characters of the first संधि are repeated in the second संधि, the thread of the story is not the same This feature, it will be seen, is common to दामकप्रहसन too, and though the present one has better claims for being regarded as a play, its technique is loose and does not conform, at places, to the rules laid down by NS and others It resembles in nature more to the popular dramatical spectacles like रामलीला and भाड, for there are certain features present here, which are not seen in any of the extant Sanskrit dramas, nor are they mentioned as admissible by any theorist For illustration विदूषक says "Oh कान्त,

narrate the पुराण", even when no करट is present on the stage But करट enters on hearing these words of the chieftain Thus these entrances and exits are so abrupt and at times so unwarranted that they indicate an open-air theatre

In the प्रस्तावना, only the सूत्रधार figures and he carries on his monologue by resorting to आकाशभाषित which is remarkable

But why are the incidents in the two संधिs unconnected as far as the thread of the story goes? We have seen this feature to be present in समवकार and in seems to be reminiscent of a time when these spectacles were performed just for diversion Of course, this will be a specimen of the संकीर्ण type as it is so coarse

लटकमेलक: This is a coarser type of प्रहसन which would therefore be classified as प्रकीर्ण according to the rules laid down by NS

प्रस्तावना in this प्रहसन is, on the whole, regular as it shows all the necessary features – like giving the title and the name of the drama and the author etc , – but it is peculiar in so far as it has सूत्रधार alone present on the stage, throughout the प्रस्तावना There is one very peculiar feature in these coarser types of प्रहसन As noted before, entrances of the characters are either abrupt or are announced beforehand, not in the course of the conversation that might precede but by special verses recited in नेपथ्य In this drama there are several occasions when this has happened See pp

5, 6, etc On page 7 the following is seen.

सभा.– कुल्व्याधे, समाहूयता जन्तुकेतुनामा महावैद्य. ।

कुल —(जन्तुकेतुमाहूय)

This shows that कुल्व्याधि did not actually leave the stage but called aloud keeping his place on the stage It should be remembered that the physician was not supposed to be in any adjoining room, from where he was to be called, but he was to be called from his house such a device for the purpose is both crude and unusual See also pp 12, 14, 17, 20, 21

हास्यार्णव This too, is a सङ्कीर्ण type and shows the same features about the entrances of the characters. See pp 22, 23

मत्तविलास This is a specimen of the शुद्ध type and as the nature of the शुद्ध type requires, does not show any indecent language or low taste as is the case with the above four प्रहसनs Though the chief characters in this drama are a कापालिक and his wife, the plot is pleasant without being coarse Of course, it is not as exalted as भगवदज्जुकम्, but genuine mirth is excited by the clever situation created by the author

भगवदज्जुकम् This प्रहसन seems to represent the शुद्ध type, inspite of its having a गणिका as a character This गणिका, like वसन्तसेना of मृच्छकटिक, is a lady as noble as a कुलजा and seems to be as consistent in her love as her namesake. The whole piece has an exalted air about it Even in the conver-

sation between the teacher and the pupil, there is nothing that may be termed coarse It is a masterpiece of simple techniqne and plot-structure It is easily the best of our प्रहसनs The गणिका is a lady of accomplishments and refined taste and does not show any lower traits like the common harlots that figure in नाटवाट or लटकमेलक or हास्यार्णव

I have noted above that the presence of गणिका in this प्रहसन, may constitute a difficulty in calling it a प्रहसन of the शुद्ध type, but the गणिका as represented here, is a lady of culture and accomplishments and does not present any traits of a वेशस्त्री as such Her consistant love for शमिलक raises her to the level of a कुलजा Moreover, the भगवत् seems to be the chief character in this drama, the गणिका turns up incidentally and provides a suitable incident for the development of the drama Thus we can call it a शुद्ध type It has no विकृतभाषा (in the sense of KS), the love throughout is exalted and the humour is not excited by dull and vulgar catch-phrases but by genuine witticism and in the last portion by the funny situation created by the exchange of souls Stage-setting suggests the usual classical Sanskrit theatre and not an open-air square as is the case in other प्रहसन,

Mention in NS that a शुद्ध type may have भगवत्, तापस etc , has been already noted as peculiar In this drama the teacher is addressed as भगवत् and the title of the drama bears witness to the importance of his character The word भगवत् occurs about 10 times in this small piece May

it not be that the NS passage in question refers to this play? That this drama seems to belong to an earlier period is indicated by many traits present therein

9 भाण

NS (XVIII, 151-154) divides भाण into two types according as the hero describes his own experiences or those of others but it should be carried on by one character only

There must be speeches in the air, with fitting histrionics There must be धूर्त, विट and others एकाज in the text would be better emended as एकाङ्क, which is actually the reading in KS (P 325), which has borrowed these verses bodily from here

DR (3, 53) One expert विट describes vile incidents experienced by himself or by others, by means of speeches in the air, by addressing (an imaginary person) and answering himself He should suggest वीर and शृङ्गार, by describing valour and beauty respectively, mostly resorting to भारती style Act 1 Plot imaginary सन्धि मुख and निर्वहण with their sub-divisions Ten sorts of लास्याङ्ग are in place

KS (P 325) remarks that this type is mostly for the diversion of the ordinary people (इतरजन)

ND (P. 127) adds that it is popular it should have शृङ्गार predominent, also वीर and हास्य may receive subordinate treatment It should have only one act, for the action must last only

for one day There should be वाचिकाभिनय only, not सात्त्विक or आङ्गिक Here, some want imaginary story and विट to be a hero

BP (P 244) mentions the view of कोहल and others about भाण which differs from the above in only one point that it should have शृङ्गार only (शृङ्गारैकरसाश्रयम्) This is also the opinion of भोज

Examples · RS शृङ्गारमञ्जरी is the chief illustration as it exhibits all the ten लास्याङ्ग SD लीलामधुकर

Remarks

पद्मप्राभृतकम् The स्थापना is peculiar In it the सूत्रधार recites five consecutive verses without even one line in prose The first verse being a benedictive stanza has the character of the usual नान्दी Other four stanzas describe the vernal season Even at the end of the fifth verse there is no indication of any character entering Throughout the स्थापना only the सूत्रधार is on the stage, and no other character like मारिष is introduced to carry on the dialogue about the usual matters of the name of the drama etc, nor does the सूत्रधार himself supply the information

It treats of शृङ्गार only, having no suggestion of वीर or हास्य

Though the विट indulges in smart conversation with different hataerae, most portion is taken up by him in talking to his friends whom he meets and who are in one or the other way connected with the various hataerae

There are only two सन्धि and one act

It has no भरतवाक्य nor a stanza which can take *the place of one*

धूर्तविटसंवाद It has no नान्दी verse, or one which can take its place, as a benedictory verse. स्थापना is direct, short and to the point Only the सूत्रधार enters who in his speech addresses his wife as आर्ये even when she is not on the stage, and urges her to sing in praise of monsoon Then he himself sings one verse describing monsoon but no नटी *enters and no verse is put in her mouth* This is rather queer It may be that सूत्रधार is supposed to resort to आकाशभाषित, though there is no response like 'किं ब्रवीषि'

There is शृङ्गार only

विट, here, goes to the वेशवाट, but talks to only one or two hataerae and then discusses certain principles regarding the conduct of वेश्याः and such other allied *subjects*, *all of which seems to be a* faithful illustration of उक्तियुक्ति, for all the while the two friends are strolling in the गोष्ठीशाला and discussing these subjects. There is almost no dramatic technique As a matter of fact there is no plot One cannot distinguish between मुख and निर्वहण It is merely an incident that happens to a विट, who feeling anxious, moves out and going into the वेशवाट without any set purpose, begins to discuss the subjects with his friend who happens to meet him It is very peculiar

उभयाभिसारिका it has शृङ्गार only It is much simpler in technique than the later भाणs and yet

forms a model for the later ones, as it describes a विट starting out to bring about a union between two lovers who had been separated due to some misunderstanding On the way, he comes across six hatterae and converses with them in his clever manner

पादताडितकम् It treats of शृङ्गार only

शृङ्गारभूषण, रसमदन, शृङ्गारतिलक, शृङ्गारसर्वस्व and मुकुन्दानन्द are all alike in nature and reveal the set type, showing two सन्धि, one act, predominence of शृङ्गार, suggestion of Heroic and most of the लास्याङ्ग मुकुन्दानन्द is called a मिश्रभाण in its प्रस्तावना but no such division of भाण is known to our extant theory What is it? Does it refer to the mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit? It is there Also see further under भाण-उपरूपक

कर्पूरचरित has only Heroic and resembles चतुर्भाणी in technique

It will be seen that the only fundamental difference between the earlier and later theorists is about रस, earlier exponents (like Kohala and others) requiring शृङ्गार only and the later writers allowing Heroic, too This must actually refer to general development of this type of drama, and the fact that all the four भाण्s published in चतुर्भाणी show शृङ्गार only and no suggestion of Heroic at any stage, may go to prove their priority to DR and other later works

10 वीथी

Def DR (avaloka) because it is like a

वीथी i e a street or a series of sub-divisions ND वक्रोक्तिमार्गेण गमनाद् वीथीव वीथी (P. 132)

NS (XVIII, 155-166) Act 1. It should have one or two actors only It should have the 13 वीथ्यङ्ग्s

DR (3, 62) वृत्ति कैशिकी सन्धि and अङ्क as in भाण रस शृङ्गार to be suggested and others may be touched It should have one or two characters

KS (P 325) interprets the एकहार्य and द्विहार्य of NS as having one or two actors and notes that in the case of one actor speeches may be carried on by *questions and answers*

ND (P 132) All heroes, all रस सन्धि मुख and निर्वहण It, at this stage, quotes कोहल's definition of वीथी

उत्तमाधममध्याभिर्युक्ता प्रकृतिभिस्त्रिभिः ।
एकहार्या द्विहार्या वा सा वीथीति (त्वभि) संज्ञिता ॥

Thus कोहल allows all sorts of heroes here शङ्कुक, it is here pointed out, does not desire अधम heroes in वीथी and reserves them for प्रकरण, भाण etc.

BP (P 251) first lays down that वीथ्यङ्ग्s as well as लास्याङ्ग्s are proper here and then notes that कोहल allows option about लास्याङ्ग्s, while भोज positively prescribes them on account of शृङ्गार being the prominent रस

RS: Heroine सामान्या or परकीया but कुलजा is not proper

Examples BP. बकुलवीथी, इन्दुलेखा etc SD मालविका RS माधवीविका

CHAPTER IV

EVOLUTION OF RŪPAKAS

CHAPTER IV

EVOLUTION OF RŪPAKAS

I have already suggested that नाटक and प्रकरण are the two types of full-fledged drama, into which all the other types gradually developed. It is, now, easier for us to consider this suggestion. The details of the various individual types of रूपक that we have gathered here from different sources, give us a fairly definite idea about the nature of each one of these. From a comparative study of these details, it follows that there runs a common thread between all these types, showing their inter-connections. Let us dwell upon this a little.

The first and foremost criterion in this regard, is the number of acts[1]. It will be seen that there are five types which may be designated as

1. Compare the following view expressed by Prof. K. H. Dhruva, in his Introduction to the Gujarati translation of स्वप्न (P. 22ff.) 'In the gradual evolution of dramas *one-act drama is the original type*. Ancient sages being free from the daily programme of their rituals resorted to it as an innocent means of diversion. This drama of the 8th century B. C. was a one-act drama and was entirely composed in Sanskrit. At this age (i. e. at a later age when the one-act drama had evolved into a form having many acts) certain professional actors would perform their dramas before the नागरक of the town, but for household purposes one-act play was always welcome. The short interval of dusk being fixed for such performances, lengthy dramas with many acts had no scope for their domestic life.'

one-act dramas, and it is easily understood that one-act dramas, being simple in structure, are the most primitive types of dramatic forms, from which other complicated types must have evolved भाण वीथी, अङ्क, प्रहसन and व्यायोग should have, according to the unanimous sanction of all the theorists, only one act Let us distinguish between these and *find out if there are any threads*, suggestive of a serial evolution or mutual connection Out of these five varieties, भाण is at once, distinct by its having only one actor All other forms presuppose dialogue, while भाण is essentially based on monologue and to obviate the difficult of its being rendered monotonous by having no उक्तिप्रत्युक्ति, the ingenious method of आकाशभाषित is adopted This makes the performance lively and audience interested Thus, this essentially monologous form combines the elements of dialogue into its very structure, without which it would be reduced to the state of a नृत्यप्रकार This monologous nature of भाण, combined with the fact that it was allowed only one act, shows its primitive nature वीथी is a mere variant of भाण with which it has many features in common Both have one act भाण has erotic रस, so has वीथी लास्याङ्ग are allowed in both the cases भाण was *par excellence* a hataerae drama There are indications that वीथी, too, had such a nature RS allows for वीथी, सामान्या or परकीया heroine, but no कुलजा So too, कोहल allowed all heroes even अधम, though सट्टक *does not* want an अधम hero This may suggest that वीथी, as it distinguished itself from भाण,

assumed a nobler role, discarding the coarser nature of भाण Another point in which वीथी differed from भाण, as it developed, is the fact that theory allows in it, one or two characters KS well points out that in the case of its having one character, speeches in the air may be resorted to, and in the case of two characters, the story may *be carried on by questions-and-answers.* Thus the nature of वीथी, as described in our extant dramaturgical works is transparent enough to show how it has developed from a type like भाण Take out two characters and उत्तमादि heroes and you have भाण and add to भाण these two features and you have वीथी

Then the art takes a step further People became familiar with forms of drama, having more characters than one Artists could see that this gave richness and variety to the drama, and they soon adopted this feature It was at such a time that भाण gave rise to प्रहसन and वीथी to अङ्क The coarser side of भाण, stressing the humourous side of the plot and subordinating शृङ्गार, gave rise to प्रहसन[2] while वीथी, stressing the tragic side

2. प्रहसनs have been distinguished as शुद्ध and संकीर्ण and [illegible] though, in the main they conform to the rules of [illegible] dramaturgy, the extant संकीर्ण *types present some intrinsic* features which are never seen in other extant dramas or in our theory We have already noted that the संकीर्ण type shows a queer peculiarity about the *entrances of* the characters It seems that a character entered in three different manners Sometimes, a character before it actually entered the stage was announced in one or

of life created अङ्क[3] These changed their वृत्तिs as it suited their subject-matter व्यायोग differed from these types only in one point that it should have fight etc, in the plot

It must be noted that अङ्क, प्रहसन, and व्यायोग can have any number of characters and this feature being a definite advance on भाण and वीथी, prepared the ground for further development of the drama With many actors to play the role of various characters in a plot, it was easy to extend the action from one act to many acts Thus

two verses Sometimes, without any indication in the conversation between characters already present on the stage, a character 'would be introduced by the stage-direction - प्रविश्य - inspite of there being no haste oi emergency for such a procedure Sometimes again, a character already present on the stage would call aloud anothei character who is not supposed to be in the vicinity, as in लटकमेलक All these three ways are unusual They presuppose an open air theatre such as a temple court-yard, without almost any stage setting Such a feature of entrances is actualli present to day in our popular rustic spectacles like भवाई in Gujarat It, therefore, to my mind, refers to a lower development of the dramatic technique This trait, combined with the fact that this type of प्रहसन, caters for the coarser taste of the low class people, may suggest that this संकीर्ण type may have been earlier to evolve than the शुद्ध type

3 It will be seen that the period of one act dramas had no need of a word for 'act अङ्क at that time designated a particular type of drama, but later on when this type अङ्क fell into disuse and when complicated dramas developed, it came to mean an act

arose more types, showing a plot extending over many days and involving many characters, thus necessitating more acts डिम, ईहामृग and समवकार arose at such a period. ईहामृग is a direct development of व्यायोग. NS has a general note that whatever heroes, वृत्तिs and रस are in व्यायोग, they should be present in ईहामृग too, only that here the union with *the heroine should be effected*. Thus ईहामृग with its four acts, is an elaboration of व्यायोग[4], which has only one act. Of course there is some distinction in plot between these two. डिम too, is a variant of व्यायोग. Both डिम and ईहामृग should have haughty रस. Heroes are many in व्यायोग. व्यायोग represents scenes of mild fights, while *डिम has terrible fights and disorders of every sort*. समवकार also is akin to व्यायोग and डिम. It culminates in haughty रस, having cyclonic disturbances etc., but it also shows the relieving feature in the form of शृङ्गार which should form a thread of the plot. Elaborate instructions about plot-arrangement (e. g. three different threads in three *sections yielding in all nine threads*) show that out of these eight varieties, this form of drama – समवकार – was the most complicated one. समवकार with 12 heroes, 3 कपटs, 3 विद्रवs, 3 शृङ्गारs, and with its duration of 18 नाडिकाs, had reached a point of development which soon led to the standard types – नाटक and प्रकरण.

It may be argued that प्रहसन *may have been*

4. That KS and SD allow even one act to ईहामृग clearly shows its nearness to व्यायोग

the first type to evolve and भाण might have been developed from it by the process of condensation, for both these types show the following features

भाण	प्रहसन
(1) one actor	(1) many actors
(2) आकाशभणित	(2) no आकाशभणित
(3) one act	(3) two acts

Thus either प्रहसन may be taken as an elaboration of the original भाण or भाण may be taken as a condensation of प्रहसन For, natural growth takes place both ways (1) towards a greater simplicity by analysis or (2) towards a greater complexity by synthesis i e by additions, reduplications, joining various threads etc

But it is enough to point out that condensation of many actors into one is neither more artistic nor more convenient nor more natural and भाण by this feature alone is fully entitled to be taken as the first type to evolve It is, however, possible that two distinct kinds of spectacles one embodying monologue and the other dialogue might have run parallel in the course of evolution, monologue having stopped at भाण and वीथी, while the dialogue developed into the higher types But against this militate the number of acts, low theme of the subject-matter etc, in a प्रहसन ऋग्वेद shows both monologue and dialogue, but from the dramatical development as seen in our dramaturgical books, it is safer to presume that while both these forms of representation

were known to the society, monologous form was the first to be resorted to as a regular dramatic form, from which other forms developed as shown above At any rate, I suggest that we take भाण as our first dramatic evolute as a working basis and at the end of this volume, we shall see how this working basis stands

It is at least clear that नाटक and प्रकरण presuppose these types and must have developed from them. ईहामृग and डिम stop at four acts नाटक and प्रकरण with more elaborate setting, would require more acts and are allowed five to ten acts *Explicit instructions that a* प्रकरण should have no उदात्त hero, no divine element, no kingly grandeur, but should have all the धूर्तs, having दास, विट, also more of कैशिकी and less of वृत्ती, show that this type preserves the coarser and more popular side of life, as represented in भाण, प्रहसन etc Of course, as it was a full-fledged type, having the sanction of critics, and theorists, it had an alternative of having कुलजा as a heroine and a ब्राह्मण *etc.*, as a hero *But the very sanction* hat it can have a सामान्या as a heroine, and the clear mention in NS that it must have more of कैशिकी, leave no doubt whatsoever about its coarser nature. नाटक, on the other hand, was the literary drama *par excellence*. It combined and sublimated the elements seen in व्यायोग, अङ्क, डिम, ईहामृग and समवकार and yet added an individuality of its own It can have करुण, शृङ्गार or वीर as a predominant रस Its plot *must be renowned*, which would make the

hero a noble character NS notes that it may depict the life-incidents of a king or it may have a divine hero and it should have grandeur, luxury and prosperity of every kind DR goes further into details and requires the hero to be full of noble qualities, noble and calm, powerful, desirous of fame, highly energetic, preserver of वेदs, and of a famous descent All this shows that नाटक was the drama of the upper classes of the society, that it was the ideal perfection to which this class of literary and artistic presentation could attain, that it was amongst plays what a महाकाव्य was amongst poems

Thus a common thread runs through all these types and a serial evolution of नाटक and प्रकरण from the earlier types is indicated But if this thesis is correct, the statement—नाटकप्रकरणोद्भवासु etc , – seen in भगवदज्जुकम् would directly militate against it, for it clearly states that other types have sprung from नाटक and प्रकरण But this should not hamper us Indian mind has always been slow to recognise historical evolution and when once नाटक and प्रकरण became fixed types of full-fledged dramas, it became quite natural for an ordinary reviewer to suppose that the lesser types had sprung from them That नाटक was accepted as the drama proper is seen in its treatment in all the text-books of Sanskrit Dramaturgy They invariably start with नाटक, describe all the details necessary for a नाटक and then merely give the points of distinctions in which other types differ from it other points

remaining common This practice of treating नाटक as the drama proper and other types as its variants, is as old as NS It would be seen that the theorists, for the sake of brevity and convenience, would resort to such a method it would be far *more convenient to describe the full-fledged* type first and then to note down the differences in the case of other types, than the other way This practice, adopted by all, would lend colour to the belief that the other types had sprung from नाटक This would thus explain the reference in भगवदज्जुकाम्

Moreover, as the fully fledged types of नाटक and प्रकरण came to be fully grasped and gained in popularity, new dramatists would attempt to compose more and more plays of these types, the composition of new plays of the lower types would cease to be attractive, the older ones (of the lower types) already there in the literature would also gradually lose in popularity and only the best or the most widely known amongst them would be preserved This will explain the fact that we do not get very early specimens of one-act plays, which I have assumed to be the earliest bases of the later developed types Thus it is that we do not possess earlier specimens of भाण, प्रहसन, वीथी etc Of course, we can never be positive in the matter, for we know too little of the plays of the lower types that might have once existed *And yet there is some evidence to show*

a wider prevalence of these one-act plays in the earlier days In Appendix I, I have given a list of the dramas as quoted by our extant dramaturgical works But even here there is a handicap The dramaturgical texts from which we get these data, date from the 10th century downwards, for, the earliest amongst these are DR and Abh However these lists will give some idea of the extent to which these different types had developed

Moreover we have seen that in earlier times the common term for drama was नाट्य and when नाट्य was separating itself from the नृत्य-type, no new terminology must have been created all at once We shall see further that most of the eight types of रूपक (and even प्रकरण) are traceable to some vulgar नृत्त or नृत्य type and as these types went on transforming themselves into नाट्य types, the new types were also designated by the older terms (cf भाण and its variants)[5] and it was only after the नाट्य types had fully developed into प्रकरण and नाटक that an attempt to give them a dramatic terminology must have been made Till then, all that was dramatic was either नाट्य or नाटक प्रकरण, too,

5 Out of the terms designating the five one act plays, at least three वीथी, प्रहसन and भाण most probably, existed earlier than the time of the evolution of our first drama tic type भाण as a form of mere नृत्त is known to SR प्रहसन and वीथी as नाट्यांगs are known to NS This means that the sense of these terms have changed, elementary idea denoted by the terms remaining as the predominent feature of the later dramatic types designated by them

seems to have been used in a generic sense. Later on, they saw the full-fledged type of नाटक and relegated all other types to the subordinate class This seems to be the reason of the rather loose terminology about the types of drama in earlier times [6]

6 One point of distinction may be noted with regard to these types Just as there were different रसs prescribed for different types so also the subject matter varied according to the different types An analysis shows that out of the five one-act dramas भाण प्रहसन and वीथी should have imaginary plots and अङ्क should have renowned plot but it is allowed an imaginary one on occasions व्यायोग has renowned plot ईहामृग समवकार and डिम which are the developments of व्यायोग have renowned plots This may suggest that our drama was secular and resorted to myths history and divine legends as it developed but of this later That differant रसs were prescribed for different types will be *seen from the following also* (Abh II P 450-I) —

इदमिह भावास्यम्—य एते उत्सृष्टिकाङ्कादयो रूपकभेदाः ते तावदेकरसा एव, यद्यपि नाट्यधर्मोऽप्येवमेव । तथाहि सर्वरसान्वयनायामपि नाटके प्रकरणे च धनार्थादिवीर एव प्रधानं परमार्थेन सर्वेषु नायकभेदेषु वीरत्वानुगम-दर्शनात् । समवकारे तु यद्यपि हि शृङ्गारादित्वमुक्तं तथापि वीर एव प्रधानं रौद्रो वा, डिमव्यायोगयोरप्येवम् । ईहामृगेऽपि रौद्रप्राधान्यमेव, नाटिकायां तु शृङ्गार एव प्रधानम् । एवं तावद् वीररौद्रशृङ्गारा यथास्वं [किं] पुनरेवमाभूत्स्वेन वर्तमाना एतेषु प्रयोगेषु शान्तबीभत्सरसौ तु

चरमपुमर्थयोगात्तत्र च सर्वस्य नाधिकारोऽपि कस्यचिदपश्चिमजन्मनोऽधिकारान्नाटके यद्यपि तत्फलप्रधानतया प्राधान्यमवलम्बेयाता तथापि नासौ प्रचुरप्रयोग इति तयो पुरुषार्थप्रवर्तकाणितयोरपि वीरादिरसान्तराध्यावापनात्स्थापनम् । एव तावत्पुमर्थविषयो रूपकरसविषय एव परमार्थे, तथापि त्वितिवृत्तवैतत्यादसान्तरप्रयोगोऽपि तदङ्गतया तत्र भवति । एव तत्प्रधानचेष्टायोगाद्वृत्तिवैचित्र्यमत्रोचितमेव । उत्सृष्टिकाङ्कप्रहसनभाणास्तु करुणहास्यविस्मयप्रधानत्वाद् रञ्जकरसप्रधाना, तत एवात्र स्त्रीबालमूर्खादिरधिकारी ।

CHAPTER V
DERIVATIVE TYPES

CHAPTER V
DERIVATIVE TYPES

I consider the following types as derivative types i e types that are later than and derived from the full-fledged नाटक and प्रकरण There is some evidence to corroborate this view and I shall consider the same at the end of this section. Let us first see the traits of these types as recognised in theory

1 नाटी or नाटिका

NS (XVIII, 106–168). A mixture of the plot of नाटक and प्रकरण causes what is called नाटी. It must have many females, four acts, graceful histrionics well-arranged अङ्ग, profuse song, dance and music and erotic enjoyment A king may act there: it should represent anger, conciliation and दम्भ It must have नायक, देवी and परिजन

Abh. (NS G O S vol II P. 435ff)

By well-arranged अङ्ग अभिनव understands the अङ्ग of कैशिकी. अभिनव has some discussion about the heroine in नाटिका. According to him [illegible] should refer to the younger heroine and [illegible] should refer to the देवी Following [illegible] will be found useful (P 435–36)

ननु यस्याः क्रोधो भवति सा न काचिदुक्तेत्याशङ्क्याह [illegible] देवी [illegible] नायिका तथामिलितनायिकान्तरविषये [illegible] [illegible] सम्भवति। एतदुपलक्षणं सर्वं तदेन्यत्। [illegible] भवति। यस्मादेनं नाटिकेति सम्प्रदायानुसारेण भट्टलोल्लटाद्याः। श्रीशङ्कुकस्तु [illegible] व्याचष्टे। तथा हि देवी कन्या च [illegible]-

तामेदेन चतुर्धा, कन्या तन्न पुरसङ्गीतकभेदेन द्विवेति। **घण्टकादयस्तु** आहु –नायको नृप तेरियताम्नमा र नाटकादावुपजीवित न तु प्रत्यान्तरमपि तद्भेद-द्वयादन्येऽप्यासिति षोडशभेन इति। नायको नृपतिरिति ये प्रथमा पठन्ति तैर्यैनेत्य याहृत्यैकवाक्यतया तृभयस्य कार्यम्। अन्ये प्रथमतार्धं पृथगेव च वाक्य योजयन्ति प्रकरणभेदात्प्रकरणलक्षणाशात् उत्पाद्य वस्तु नाटकलक्षणाशाच्च नृपतिर्नायक इयते यन्नेत्यभिप्राये नाटिकेवभूतेति।

DR (3, 46 52) Plot should be taken from प्रकरण and hero a king, from नाटक 3, 48 suggests that it may have even 1, 2, 3 or 4 acts देवी should be the elder queen, born of a king, serene and मानिनी, while the heroine should be मुग्धा, दिव्या and very beautiful Heroine may remain in the vicinity of the king, by her connection with the harem, while the hero may remain apprehensive through the fear of the queen

It sholud have the four elements of कैशिकी in respect of the four acts

ND (P 120–122) Out of the two heroines, queen and the कन्या, each one or both may be renowned or otherwise, thus yielding four types of नाटिका It is noted here that the plot in a नाटिका is sparse

BP (P 243) Hero should be renowned and धीरललित रस erotic, वृत्ति कैशिकी सन्धि except अवमर्श It should have no विट, but विदूषक may figure there

Examples BP प्रियदर्शिका SD विद्धशालभञ्जिका RS मालविकाग्निमित्र

2 प्रकरणी or प्रकरणिका

ND (P 122) recognises this type calling it a variation of नाटिका wherein the hero should be taken

from प्रकरण and the heroine should belong to the hero's class It is noted that नाटिका and प्रकरणिका both concern themselves with erotic enjoyments, but while the former treats of the royal love, the latter depicts the love of merchants etc

SD follows ND

MMC notes this but has nothing special

3 तोटक or त्रोटक

BP (P 238, 4–14) This is a variety of नाटक. According to हर्ष, नाटक with a contact between divine and human elements and with acts void of विदूषक, becomes तोटक But others do not accept this view According to these others, it may have 9, 8, 7, or 5 acts and a mixture of divine and human

SD (VI 273) adds that it must have विदूषक in each act

Examples BP मेनकानहुष-9 acts, मदलेखा 8–acts, स्तम्भिन्तरम्भकम्-7 acts (both these are void of विदूषक), विक्रमोर्वशीयम्–5 acts

4 सट्टक

BP (P 269) It is a variety of नाटक based on नृत्य. वृत्ति कैशिकी and भारती रस no terrible रस No सन्धि It should be full of शौरसेनी, महाराष्ट्री According to some the king should not speak in Prakrit, others prescribe मागधी or शौरसेनी for him

It should have, in place of अङ्क, four parts with curtain being dropped on account of the impossibility of छादन स्वप्न, भ्रान्ति etc

ND (P 213) notes that it should have only one language, not a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit It should not have विष्कम्भक or प्रवेशक

SD (VI, 276) It should have Prakrit only and mostly अद्भुत रस अङ्कs should be called जवनिकाs

N B BP calls it नृत्यभेदात्मक and thus treats it as a नृत्यप्रकार

Remarks

That नाटिका and प्रकरणिका should be taken as the derivative types is self-evident from their very names Both are derivative names Moreover, though नाटिका, known to NS as नाटी, seems to have been recognised rather early, its dependence on नाटक, is clear from its plot प्रकरणी seems to have enjoyed quite a temporary existance, there being found almost no example of the type And the very fact that it has been recognised by such a late work as ND and by no other earlier work, goes to prove that it was a futile attempt on the part of the later theorists to create a new type, perhaps on the analogy of नाटिका

तोटक, as it is recognised by हर्ष, is rather early and yet its derivative character is clear As a matter of fact there is very little distinguishing element about it

सट्टक, on the other hand, may not have been a derivative type, inspite of BP's mention that it is a variety of नाटक BP itself, later on calls it a नृत्यप्रकार It must have been a popular spectacle, as its loose technique shows That there were no regular acts

but a drop-curtain was required, shows an irregular and therefore unsettled nature of this type As a matter of fact, drop-curtain, in earlier Sanskrit Literature, is not suggested anywhere Moreover, the very name of the type is Prakrit and the preponderence of Prakrit languages indicates a popular and perhaps a more primitive type than नाटिका The differences of opinion with regard to the language to be used in this type are themselves enough to prove its unsettled character

IRREGULAR TYPES

Keith in his *Sanskrit Drama* enumerates some types of Drama, which he calls irregular Type represented by the महानाटक is distinct and is fully discussed by Keith and De Allegorical dramas like प्रबोधचन्द्रोदय and others form another group and though they have existed from early times, theory has not recognised them separately For all these the student is referred, to Keith's book There are, however, one or two points which I shall like to touch upon here

Was there a dramatic type called डमरुक ? Compare the following verse seen in the description of the preface of a drama named नवग्रहचरितम् by घनश्याम in the Descriptive Cat of San Mss Tanjore, vol VIII, P 3693

> प्रहसनडमरुकनाटकमङ्ककाव्यं द्विमञ्जरीभाणान् ।
> देवीनाटकलिपि कृतवान्यश्चान्यमिष्टशतचम्पूम् ॥

This verse places डमरुक, with प्रहसन and others

There is however a Ms of a drama called डमरुक by घनश्याम described in the Descriptive Cat of the San Mss, in the Govt Oriental Library, Madras, Vol XXI—kavyas, No 12517, which seems to be a type *distinct from all other types* hitherto known It is described therein as a peculiar dramatic work Instead of acts it has ten अलंकारs into which it is divided They are named as राजानुरञ्जन, कलिदूषण, सुकविसंजीवन, कुकविसंतापन, अन्नोधान्स्र, शाब्दिकभञ्जन, पण्डितसर्वस्व, जातिसतर्जन प्रभुवर्णन, अखण्डानन्द But as far as this particular work is concerned it is needless to suppose that it was actually recognised as a particular type in theory It seems to have been an attempt on the part of घनश्याम to create a new type without any backing of theory That घनश्याम possessed this love of experimentation is seen from another of his work नवग्रहचरित which too has been described as a dramatic type

There is also one other drama which seems to have been irregular A drama named ययातिदेवयानीचरित by an unknown author is described in the same Cat of Madras, Vol XXI It is not divided into acts etc There is no regular प्रस्तावना, and yet in what appears like a प्रस्तावना, चेत्रधार, instead of a सूत्रधार enters There is a भरतवाक्य also

But these seem to be stray efforts by individual writers at innovations They are, however, not recognised in theory, as all these poets are very late in date

CHAPTER VI

NṚTYA-TYPES (*Uparūpakas*)

NRTYA-TYPES (UPARUPAKAS)

Species of Nrtya-Type—general

NS does not mention any उपरूपक but treats of नाटी which is the same as नाटिका of the later theorists, and we have seen that it is a derivative type But Keith says (*Sanskrit Drama*, P. 349) "Needless to say, though omitted in the नाट्यशास्त्र quotations are found ascribing to Bharata the doctrine, though he mentions in them but fifteen with several variations of name". He, in this connection refers to Hall, DR P 6 It is true that some terms, which in later works, did designate certain उपरूपकs are seen in NS, but this mention of them is very incidental and often vague, affording us no clue as to their real nature

AP (अध्याय 328) enumerates the following seventeen varieties, without calling them उपरूपकs and without defining or discussing them

तोटक, नाटिका, सट्टक, शिल्पक, कर्ण, दुर्मल्लिका, प्रस्थान, भाणिका, भाणी, गोष्ठी, हल्लीशक, काव्य, श्रीगदितम्, नाट्यरासक, रासक, उल्लाप्यक and प्रेक्षण.

DR (avaloka) mentions the following seven incidentally the following verse which is quoted in this connection may have been an old verse

> डोम्बी श्रीगदितं भाणो
> भाणीप्रस्थानरासकाः ।
> काव्यं च सप्त नृत्यस्य
> भेदाः स्युस्तेऽपि भाणवत् ॥

Abh, incidentally, mentions the following nine (P 183)

डोम्बिका, भाण, प्रस्थानम्, षिद्गक भाणिका, प्रेरणम्, रामाक्रीडम्, हल्लीशकम्, and रासकम्

Abh does not call them by the name उपरूपक and it seems that he did not take them as such The point is discussed further on by us

DR, PR, RS and MMC do not note उपरूपकs as such

KS adds श्रीगदित and गोष्ठी to the list of Abh

SP mentions fourteen and defines them but all these are treated by BP

BP (P 255) has these twenty

तोटक, नाटिका, गोष्ठी, सल्लाप, शिल्पक, डोम्बी, श्रीगदितम्, भाणी, प्रस्थान, काव्य, प्रेक्षणक, सट्टकम्, नाट्यरासकम्, लासक (रासक), उल्लोप्यक, हल्लीश, दुर्मल्लिका, मल्लिका, कल्पवल्ली, पारिजातक

But on P 256 ff, are defined these types individually where सट्टक is omitted (it is later treated as an additional variety) and भाण is added, and भाणी of the above list, is included under भाणिका Further on at P 265-66 under the heading रासकम् it has twelve verses which describe the following types, almost in identical wordings as Abh

प्रस्थान, verses 1-2 and 7, काव्य 3-4, डोम्बिका 5, भाण 6 शिल्पक 8, भाणिका 9, रामाक्रीड 10, and रासक 11-12

ND (P. 213) has fourteen

सट्टक, श्रीगदितम्, दुर्मल्लिता, प्रस्थान, गोष्ठी, हल्लीशक, नर्तनक, प्रेक्षणक, रासक, नाट्यरासक, काव्य, भाण or भाणक, भाणिका

SD has eighteen

नाटिका, त्रोटक, गोष्ठी, सट्टक, नाट्यरासक प्रस्थानक, उल्लाप्य, काव्य, प्रेङ्खणकम्, रासकम्, संलापकम्, श्रीगदितम्, शिल्पकम्, विलासिका or विनायिका (according to others it is included under दुर्मल्लिका, so विश्वनाथ notes), दुर्मल्लिका, प्रकरणिका, हल्लीश and भाणिका

Remarks

1. The above will show that the lengthiest list is given in BP But on an analysis of all the views, we get some more types recognised at one time or the other कर्ण (AP), दुर्मिलिता (ND), which, however, may be the same as दुर्मल्लिका of BP, नर्तनक (ND), विलासिका (SD), पिद्गुक, रामाक्रीड and प्रेरण (Abh) are the additional varieties This will bring the number to 20+5= 25 Moreover, प्रकरणिका which has been taken as an उपरूपक by SD, is taken by others as an offshoot of प्रकरण So also, नाटिका and त्रोटक may be taken as the derivative types, as suggested by us

2 The peculiar situation, given rise to by the non-mention in Bharata of the उपरूपकs, has been thus explained away by Mr K S Ramaswami Sastri in his Introduction to BP(p 51)

"From what has been said before and from certain statements contained in the present नाट्यशास्त्र it seems to be probable that कोहल and his followers who made the नाट्यवेद easily accessible to the dramatists by their works, had invented the उपरूपकs whose number differs with each authority definition of त्रोटक, one of the उपरूपकs, quoted by

शारदातनय is another proof of the existence of the उपरूपक्s before the time of हर्ष. The commentary of अभिनवगुप्त also on the last portion of the 4th Chapter of the नाट्यशास्त्र where some references from कोहल to the उपरूपक्s are made, supports[1] the contention that कोहल may be the inventor of these उपरूपक्s. हेमचन्द्र and रामचन्द्र support the same view in their works."

It will be my purpose to show later on that the उपरूपक्s, as known to SD, represent a gradual growth which can be traced even to-day and that therefore no one person can be called the inventor of these types. It should be remembered that नाट्य was considered distinct from नृत्य and that our रूपक्s were based on नाट्य, while the उपरूपक्s were based on नृत्य. As NS had no occasion to discuss and define the types based on नृत्य naturally we do not find any such statement therein. So, too, DR and Abh had no occasion to speak of them. It is true that हेमचन्द्र in the 12th century counts but 11 उपरूपक्s, while BP has as many as twenty. But it would be wrong to argue from this that these nine additional varieties came into existence in the period between KS and BP. There are indications in BP itself that शारदातनय followed earlier

1 I do not know on what grounds Mr Sastri makes this statement. It is true that Abh mentions some उपरूपक्s and we have duly noted them. But nowhere does Abh note that he was quoting the verses in question from कोहल. It is however possible that Abh quoted these verses from some older source but there is no indication whatsoever to know that source definitely

works and traditions and it should be remembered that AP knew seventeen varieties of so called उपरूपक It seems highly plausible that rhythmic dance while it was incorporating the histrionic art in it, was, at the same time, gradually developing these उपरूपक and it may be that कोहल had for the first time arranged and defined them And, all the evidence cited by Mr Sastri goes to connect कोहल's name with the rise of the उपरूपक but not with their invention KS (P 325) after treating the रूपक twelve in number, has a general note to the effect that 'and others' in the धरिका refers to तोटक and others, which have been defined by कोहल and others As against this KS itself has a note at the end of that section that the details about the गेयरूपक or उपरूपक should be learnt from ब्रह्मभरत etc ब्रह्मभरतकोहलदत्तिलशालिभ्योऽवगन्तव्य —which clearly shows that KS connected भरत's name with these types

3 *Here I should point out that these varieties* known to the different writers, though bearing the same names, had not been simultaneously and uniformly developed Thus the varieties known to Abh, for instance, were very primitive when compared to the same varieties as described by BP and SD and it will be wrong to designate all of these as उपरूपक. But as I hope to clear this point later on, I shall not enter into details just now.

4 *The word* उपरूपक should naturally have

come into vogue, after the acceptance of the word रूपक by the dramaturgists We have seen that though रूप is seen in NS, रूपक seems to have come into general prevalence only after DR The word उपरूपक is still later The types usually considered as उपरूपकs were earlier known as नृत्यभेदs only DR, does not know the word उपरूपक So also KS, ND, and BP, do not know it Both KS and ND use the word रूपक for these additional varieties, KS calling them गेयरूपकs and ND describing them by अन्यानि रूपकाणि It is in SD that we meet with a definite usage of the word उपरूपक ND closes with this remark

एतानि च स्वल्पमात्ररञ्जनानिमित्तत्वादवृद्धैरनभिहितत्वाच्च वृत्तानेव कीर्तितानि।

This means that they were still in the process of being recognised as dramatic types, for as the types of नृत्य they were recognised earlier

Out of the seven forms defined by Abh, some are found in the list of these नृत्यप्रकारs as given by BP and others But Abh did not consider them as उपरूपकs They are more like mere dances Abh has a note,

एते प्रबन्धा नृत्तात्मका न नाट्यात्मका नाटकादिविलक्षणा ।

which shows that they had no element of drama and that they were based on नृत्त (of the 2nd variety as shown before), which according to later tradition would refer to नृत्य

Species of Nrtya-types–individual

1 भाण

Abh (P. 183) In this नर्तकी gives the description of सिंह, सूकर etc , with terrible movements of limbs He classifies भाणक as उद्धत and भाणिका as उद्धतमसृण

BP (P 268ff) There are two distinct principles of divisions recognised here, according to which भाण has nine different varieties It is शुद्ध when a शुद्ध (i e Sanskrit) language is used, संकीर्ण when two languages (Sanskrit and Prakrit) are used and चित्र when many languages are used There are other three varietes It is उद्धत when the plot is terrible, ललित when the plot is charming and ललितोद्धत when the plot shows elements of both.

Plot There may be descriptions and praises of हरि, हर, भवानी, स्कन्द and प्रमथाधिप It must have terrible action It must have no females, while it must be descriptive Also it may have praises of kings in गाथाs, unfolding their virtues etc It must be full of music, dialogue (सहोक्ति) and decorated by noble (scenes)

Whatever action is difficult and involves skill should be woven in a भाण

Music A शुद्ध भाण is punctuated by seven विश्रामs, each विश्राम showing a varying programme of music as under

Frist विश्राम has वर्ण, मत्तपाली, भग्नताल मात्रा
Second „ „ भग्नतालगाथा, द्विपथक, वसन्त
Third „ „ विषमच्छिन्नमात्रा, भग्नताल, मागधी, रथ्या
Fourth „ „ द्विपथक, रथ्या, and वसन्त
Fifth „ „ रथ्या, भग्नताल, मार्गनिका, द्विपथ, विषम

Here is a note that the भाण called नन्दिमाली should be included under this type, as those who consider it as a distinct type, know not भरत's view And, then, नन्दिमाली is described as follows

(1) The plot is recited or acted with reference to an आकाशपुरुष, using the word भाव (भावप्रयोगवान्) to be applied to noble persons (2) It consists mostly of terrible action (3) Sometimes it has descriptions excluding females (4) It should be full of गाथा and other ways of राजस्तुति, (5) and accompanied with good music and (6) noble speech (7) It may have praises of ब्रह्मा, रुद्र, स्कन्द, and other gods

There is a general note that whatever has been said with regard to acts, सन्धि etc, with reference to भाण of the रूपक type holds good in this case too

In the Introduction to BP it is noted that the first set of verses (i e those that do not apply to the नन्दिमाली type) are also seen in SP SP also recognises नन्दिमाली and includes it under this type But the present NS contains no reference to नन्दिमाली

ND (P 215), too, has the same six types of भाण, on the same two principles and his भाण or भाणक contains nothing new

Remarks

It will be noted that the नन्दिमाली type as described in BP, differs from the ordinary type of उपरूपक भाण only in one respect, the former has आकाशभाषित and acts etc, while the latter shows the absence of both these elements

2. भाणिका

BP (P 262) Plot भाण, having mostly हरिचरित for its subject-matter, with accepted metres in गाथाs, दोहाs, मात्राs etc, becomes by graceful gestures, भाणिका There may be nine or ten different threads, but the plot must be sparse, full of विट, पीठमर्द and विदूषक, and excitement should be created in the audience by various turns of speech.

रस mainly erotic Heroine कुलाभिरूपवनायिका सधि• void of गर्भ and विमर्श रीति पाञ्चाली

Music and dance ten लास्याङ्गs are in place as in भाण It should have द्विपदाखण्डs, should have graceful acting, नृत्त punctuated by ताल, at times रथ्या etc, and should be void of अर्धोद्घाटितविवरणपादनवमन्तनमनपार्श्वी, विश्राम and उत्ताल It should be performed by females Of course, लय and ताल may be adopted at proper places

Example वीणावती

ND (P 215) recognises this type but has nothing distinct

SD (VI, 305 ff) भाणि मुख and निर्वहण वृत्ति, कैशिकी and भारती Act 1 Heroine noble Hero मन्द SD requires the following seven अङ्गs here उपन्यास, विन्यास,

विबोध, साध्वस, समर्पण, निवृत्ति and संहार, which are defined as under when कार्य is incidentally described it is उपन्यास, when gloomy speech is uttered it is विन्यास, when doubt is removed it is विबोध, when there is boasting it is साध्वस, again समर्पण constitutes in taunting through anger, beginning of निदर्शन is निवृत्ति and actual achievement of fruit is संहार

Example कामदत्ता

Abh, (I P 183) calling भाणिका as उद्धतमसृण describes it thus In भाणिका, there is amusement due to play with children, नियुद्ध, lions or pigs or playing with banner etc

Remarks

As far as BP's description is concerned if any one wants to see two distinct types described under the caption of भाणिका, as the editor justly does he shall have to distinguish between भाणिका and भाणी, former being based on वृत्त etc , and the latter being a form of उपरूपक having संधि, अङ्ग etc This भाणी seems to be the same as डोम्बी of BP and भाणिका of SD Compare their details

3 डोम्बी or डोम्बिका

Abh (I P 183) notes a type called डोम्बिका

छन्नानुरागगर्भाभिरुक्तिभिर्यत्र भूपत ।
आवर्ज्यते मन सा तु मसृणा डोम्बिका मता ॥

BP (P 257) Act 1 वृत्ति कैशिकी and भारती रस Heroic and Erotic Heroine श्रृङ्गारैकरस्या मन्देरागा and प्रहरनायिका

Example: कनदत्त.

Editor of BP says. "This डोम्बी is known according to some as भाणिका and the same fact has been stated here in the line डोम्बेव भाणिकेदानन्तनैश्च विश्वनाथ followed that view and described this kind of drama as भाणिका with the same description as found here and with the same कनदत्ता as an example. The definition of भाणिका as given by शारदातनय and भोज is quite different from that of विश्वनाथ"

Remarks on 1, 2 and 3

Bearing in mind the descriptions of भाण, भाणिका, भाणी and डोम्बी as given in BP, one can see that भाणिका differs from भाण in the following points

(1) It is mild, (2) It has mostly हरिचरित, with nine or ten threads, (3) It has no विधान, उत्ताल and अर्धोद्ग्राह etc (4) It should be performed by females

भाणी and डोम्बी are almost identical Also it would appear that SD has no counterpart for BP's भाण, while it describes भाणिका, which, however, has similarity with BP's भाणिका, but is wholly identical with BP's डोम्बी Abb's डोम्बिका and भाणिका are, again distinct

भाणिका as defined by BP, though having a preponderance of dance-elements, contains enough elements to transfer itself into भाणिका of SD. Thus there seems to be running a common thread through भाणिका of SD and डोम्बी of BP (which, too, is called भाण्डिका or भाणिका) yielding sufficient data for

inferring a serial evolution, डोम्बी or डोम्बिका of Abh representing the earliest stage and डोम्बी of BP or भाणिका of SD the last stage of the same form of entertainment while भाणिका of BP is a variety, probably more primitive and representing the transitional stage from डोम्बिका of Abh, (Abh's भाणिका is an earliar form of BP's भाणिका) to भाणिका of SD And this भाणिका itself has a counter-part in भाण-उपरूपक, which seems to have enjoyed a temporary existence as an independent variety, as it emphasises the उद्धत acting But in भाणिका and भाणी of BP, again, there are sufficient elements (e g 9 or 10 threads, heroes विट, पीठमर्द etc ,) to develop themselves into भाण रूपक भाण रूपक seems, therefore, to be the definite ultimate dramatic form to which डोम्बिका, भाणिका, भाणी, डोम्बी, भाण उपरूपक (all of which are either नृत्त or नृत्य types, with the possible exception of भाणिका of SD and डोम्बी of BP), passed on imperceptibly आकाशभणित, which is a very important element of the भाण रूपक, though not seen in any of these forms, is recognised by BP in the case of the नन्दिमाली type of भाण

4 रासक

BP (P. 265 ff) This section of BP is hopeless for its textual accuracy Under the head of रासक, this section defines, in identical verses which have been quoted by Abh at P 183, eight forms of dances, the last of them being रासक It is thus defined here

मण्डलेन तु यन्नृत्तं तदा(ऽ 1 हल्ली)सकमिति स्मृतम् ।
एकैकस्तस्य नेता स्याद्गोपस्त्रीणां यथा हरि ॥

अनेकनर्तकीयोज्यं चित्रताललयान्वितम् ।
आचतुःषष्टियुगलाद्रासकं मसृणोद्धतम् ॥

Out of these two verses, the first is always quoted as the definition of हल्लीसक by others (see ND, Abh and elsewhere) and even BP shows the v.l. हल्लीशक, which may be the correct reading The second of the above verses is the same as is given by Abh as the definition of रासक, and this seems to be the original definition of रासक.

But BP has another definition of रासक(on P 269, 11 13-19), where it is described thus

(1) Act 1 (2) void of सूत्रधार (3) It must have well-arranged (सुश्लिष्ट) नान्दी (4) It should have five पात्रs, (5) three सन्धिs, (6) various languages, (7) कैशिकी and भारती वृत्तिs (8) वीथ्यङ्गs, (9) prominent hero, (10) famous heroine, (11) उदात्त भावs and (12) उत्तरोत्तर

A third definition of रासक is also seen in BP at P 265, 11 10-13

रम्या दुग्धहंसयो मुखे पीत्वान्त सम्या
निर्दिष्टसूत्रनिर्देशविहितो दृश्यो रसभेदैः ।
विनायोगविविधैर्नैलतुला भेदद्वयान्वित
चार्वङ्गमध्यमनुगत षोडश सभा रासक: ॥

It should be remarked here that though this verse defines रासक, it is put in this edition under the section of नाट्यरासक.

One more definition of रासक is seen in BP under नाट्यरासक, consisting of one verse, which is the one given in ND as the definition of रासक

SD (VI, 288 290) substantially agrees in the second version of BP, by defining रासक as one which should have (1) five पात्रs, (2) मुख and निर्वहण, (3) various languages, (4) भारती, and कैशिकी वृत्तिs, (5) no सूत्रधार, (6) one act, (7) वीथ्यङ्गs (8) art (कला), (9) श्लिष्टनान्दी, (10) famous heroine, (11) foolish hero (मुख्य in BP seems to be more in harmony with the nature of रासक, as defined here, than मूर्ख as read here), (12) उदात्त भावs and (13) उत्तरोत्तर

There is a note that some allow प्रतिमुख, too

Example मेनकाहितम्

ND (P 214) calls that type as रासक which has 16, 12 or 8 heroines dancing with special postures as पिण्डीबन्धs etc

5 नाट्यरासक

This section, too, as printed in BP is so much confused that I shall quote it *in extenso* and then shall try to determine the exact nature of the type

षोडशद्वादशाष्टौ वा यस्मिन्नृत्यन्ति नायिका ।
पिण्डीबन्धादिविन्यासै रासक तदुदाहृतम् ॥
पिण्डनाद्भवेत्पिण्डी गुम्फनाच्छृङ्खला भवेत् ।
भेदनाद्भेद्यको जातो लताजालोपनाहत ॥
एते उत्तात्मना कार्या नाट्यवन्त क्रियाविधौ ।
सुकुमारोद्धतैरङ्गैर्गायिकाभिर्विलक्षणा ॥
नाट्यप्रयोगयो ह्येते पिण्डाद्या हृद्यजातय ।
नव भेदा विधीयन्ते ह्यनुकार्यैरनुरागिण ॥
कामिनीभिर्भुवो भर्तुश्चेष्टितं यत्र नृत्यते ।
रागाद्वसन्तमासाद्य स ज्ञेयो नाट्यरासक ॥

चर्चरीमिति वा प्राहुर्वर्णतालेन तत्र तु ।
प्रविशेद्यमिनीयुग्म समवर्णादिशिक्षितम् ॥
वामदक्षिणसंचारैरङ्गैस्तत्परिष्कृतम् ।
ततस्तदेव वर्णान्त आलीढद्वन्द्वसंस्थितम् ॥
चोल्लिकामिव ताल वादयन्ता प्रदर्शयेत् ।
पञ्चधातक्रमत्रार्थजनस्तस्मात्प्रवर्तते ॥
नृत्तेन विमलेष्वण्डे चतुर्भिस्त्रिभिरेव वा ।
अन्योन्यादिक्रमसञ्चारैर्हस्तनालैर्मिथ कृते ॥
परिक्रम्य च निष्क्रमेत्ततोऽन्यद्द्वितयं विशेत् ।
एकस्थलम्तु नि सन्धि प्रवेशो निर्गमस्तयो ॥
पुष्पाञ्जलिप्रयोग तु मात्रातालेन योजयेत् ।
उभयो पात्रयो पश्चात्पात्राणि प्रविशन्ति हि ॥
बद्धा पगवतालेन रथ्यावर्णादिवर्तकै ।
शुष्कगीतप्रयोगेण ततो गायन्ति गायका ॥
स्ताभिर्भैचक्रैर्गुल्मैर्नानाङ्गनप्रदर्शकै ।
पात्रैश्चैक्यसंयुक्तैः पिण्डीबन्धं तु धारयेत् ॥
ततो मत्तमिव ताल शुष्कवर्णप्रयोगत ।
मुरजाक्षरवाद्यं तु हन्यात्पिण्डद्विदण्डकै ॥
एव नृत्तं क्रमेणायो प्रसार समापयेत् ।
अपसारत्रय चान्यदेतेनैव प्रकल्पयेत् ॥
तत्रापि पूर्ववन्नृत्त क्रमतस्तु त्यक्त्व ।
कथयेद्रासकस्यान्ते शुभार्थं वचनत्रयम् ॥

It will be seen that the first of these verses is a description of रासक and the next three verses give the explanations of the technical terms पिण्डीबन्ध etc पिण्डीबन्ध is so called because of the huddling up closely, शृङ्खला is so called by an arrangement of limbs like knitting, भेदक by [illegible] लताबन्ध by being arranged in the form of a net.

Then the fifth verse in the above quotation

seems to be the original definition of नाट्यरासक, particularly as ND (P 315) has this very verse alone as the definition of नाट्यरासक It is that, wherein, females dance out the doings of a king

The remaining verses explain the programme of music and dance to be followed in नाट्य

When it has वर्णताल it is called चर्चरी, wherein two females, clever in समवर्ण etc , may enter embracing one another by their limbs and moving right and left They retire after some dancing and then enters another pair of females Their exit and entrance must be simultaneous This new pair may perform the scattering of flowers by मात्राताल After this, other characters may enter with प्रणवताल and रथ्यादिवर्णs Then the singers sing with शुष्कगीतप्रयोग Then पिण्डीबन्धन formed by many पात्रs, by means of लता, भेद्यक, गुल्मक etc. should be performed Then there may occur मल्लताल with शुष्कवर्णप्रयोग and मुरजाक्षरवाद्य may be beaten with दण्डद्विदण्डक

Thus with such dancing, the first आसार would be over Three such आसारs with dancing, as before should be performed, with proper rhythm

From the last line in the above quotation it seems that this musical scheme may be applied to रासक also

Appendix II to BP contains the following additional definition of नाट्यरासक at P, 403

> पूर्वरङ्गेऽप्यरात्रेण नान्दी यत्र विधीयते ।
> मुग्धादिगधिमभिन्न वत्तनिर्द्वृत्तिचतुष्टयम् ॥

यत्र पात्राण्यमुग्मानि न कदाचन सूत्रभृत् ।
कल्प्योऽथवा नटनटीप्रवेशेनामुखक्रमः ॥
दिव्यं वा मानुषं वाथ मिश्रं वा वस्तु यत्र च ।
विप्रलम्भरसप्रायं यत्र प्रख्यातनायकम् ॥
कामिनीभिर्भुवो भर्तुश्चेष्टितं यत्र दृश्यते ।
रागाद्वसन्तमासाद्य स ज्ञेयो नाट्यरासकः ॥

An analysis of this would give the following characteristics of नाट्यरासक.

(1) full नान्दी to be recited by the characters behind the curtain, (2) सन्धि like मुख and others, (3) at times all the four वृत्तिs (4) no single character should enter, (5) सूत्रधार should be brought in or आमुख may show the presence of नट and नटी, (6) plot may be divine or both, (7) रस विप्रलम्भ, (8) famous hero, (9) females should sing and dance the doings of a king

SD (VI, 277–79) has this

(1) one act, (2) बहुताललयस्थिति, (3) Noble hero, (4) पीठमर्द as उपनायक, (5) prominent हास्य with शृङ्गार (6) heroine–वासकसज्जिका, (7) मुख निर्वहण–सन्धि, (8) all लास्याङ्ग, (9) some allow all the four सन्धि except प्रतिमुख

Example- सन्धिद्वयवती–नर्मवती, सन्धिचतुष्टयवती –विलासवती

Remarks on 4 and 5

Both these are treated at length and yet as far as BP is concerned the text as printed in G. O S, is hopelessly confused In this connection the readings noted in the Appendix II at P. 408, seem to throw quite a flood of light and would be help-

ful in reconstructing coherent text for both these types

Thus P 263, l 23 to P 266, l 14 describe both these types out of which, following reconstruction can be made

रासक

(1) P 263, l 23 to P 264, l 7 and 264, l. 10 to P 265, l 9 describe one type of रासक

(2) P 265, l 10 to P 265, l 13 embody another view agreeing in essentials with (1)

(3) P 266, l 13–14 give perhaps the earliest known definition of रासक (as the same verse is quoted by Abh at P 183), which also does not differ much in essentials from (1) and (2) above, as all these treat it as a dance-form (4) P 269, ll 12–19 give a description of रासक which differs widely from all the above three views and considers it as a type of drama

नाट्यरासक

(1) P 164, ll 8–9 preserve perhaps the earliest definition of नाट्यरासक as the same verse is found in ND This description treats it as a dance-form

(2) Description of नाट्यरासक as found on P 408 considers it as a form of drama and thus agrees in essentials with SD's definition of it

(3) P 265, l 15 to 266, l 12 (though printed under the section of रासक) contain older de-

scriptions of प्रस्थान, काव्य, डोम्बिका, भाण, शिल्पक, भाणिका, रासाक्रीड and हल्लीश (p 266, l, ll wrongly reads रासक for हल्लीश) as these very verses are found quoted by Abh at P. 183.

Therefore the definition of नाट्यरासक as given on P 408 should be taken as the correct one and be incorporated in the text as an alternative definition of नाट्यरासक, and the definition of रासक on P. 408 should only be consulted in fixing the readings of the text as printed on P. 266, for it has no more worth

These different definitions of both these forms prove beyond doubt that they have evolved from mere dance to an organised नृत्त form and thence to an elementary forms of drama.

6. प्रस्थानक

Abh (P. 183) has one verse, the same as the first type of BP as will be described below and this definition therefore, would be the earliest known definition of प्रस्थानक

BP (P 262, ll 19–22)
First type (p 266, ll 3–4)

Starting on a journey with a gait like that of an elephant constitutes प्रस्थान It should be मन्दविद्ध and उत्तान

Second type (P 265, ll 15–19, under the heading रासक) *(1) one act, (2) मुख and निर्वहण संधिs, (3) it should* have in the beginning शृङ्गार roused by journey or by first love and should end in वीर (4) It should

be full of the descriptions of monsoon and spring (5) It should have four अवमारs

Third type (P 262, ll 19-22)

(1) Two acts, (2) कैशिकीवृत्ति, (3) हिनोत्तनायक, (4) दास, विट, चेट, etc, as नायक (5) It should be charming on account of drinking and other sports, (6) and full of लय and ताल (7) मुख and निर्वहण संधि

Example शृङ्गारतिलक

ND (P 214) has only one type, the second of BP, and describes it in identical terms only pointing out that अवमारs are नृत्यच्छन्दानि खण्डानि and that it is called प्रस्थान with reference to journey, which seems to have been the original idea as suggested in the first type of BP

SD (VI, 280-281) has these additional points:

(1) heroine-दासी (2) कैशिकी and भारती as वृत्तिs

SP has only the second type of BP

7. नर्तनक

Though this variety has not been included in the general list of the उपरूपकs, it seems to have been recognised, at one time or the other, as a distinct type, for the verse that is seen in ND (P 214) and which again is found as the first verse in the description of प्रस्थानक of BP, is clearly a description of नर्तनक The verse is this

> पदार्थाभिनयं यत्र ललितं च लयान्वितम् ।
> कुरुते नर्तकी यत्र सोऽपि नर्तनकः पुनः ॥

ND also has the following explanation

यत्र पदार्थाभिनयं ललितलयं शास्ति नर्तकी कुरुते ।
सनर्तक-शम्पा-लास्य-छलित-द्विपद्यादि ॥

Then it is pointed out that शम्पा is the लास्य which is चित्रविचित्र, छलित is full of शृङ्गार, वीर and रौद्र, and द्विपदी is a छन्दोभेद लास्य is full of शृङ्गार

It seems that according to BP (P 363, l 9) this नर्तक should have छलिक (which is the same as छलित of ND) लास्य with शम्पा, सुताल and चतुरस्र. (Is this not the same as छलित नृत्य of मालविकाग्निमित्र, which too, has चतुरस्र etc ?) Also it should be void of गर्भ and विमर्श, having all वृत्तिs, full of मागधी and शौरसेनी and रस and भावs. When it has two सन्धिs it should have उत्तम and अधम heroes, and भारती and आरभटी as वृत्तिs, and rarely सात्वती

Example कालिय and वृषिहरिजय.

In fact the first five verses under प्रेक्षणक in BP, define नर्तक which is used in Masculine, and all the attributes in these verses are in Masculine, while the last three lines describe प्रेक्षणक which is taken as Neuter and all the attributes in these three lines are in Neuter

7. प्रेक्षणक

AP notes it

BP (P. 363) Definition given here suggests that नर्तक when it exhibits 'at times गर्भ and अवमर्श सन्धि, at times many नेपथ्य speeches, at times four वृत्तिs and no शृङ्गार' is प्रेक्षणक.

Example त्रिपुरदहनम्

ND (P 214) has this Whatever is performed in street, assembly, squares or temples by many पात्रs, is called प्रेक्षणक as for illustration कामदहन etc

SD (VI 286–87) calls it प्रेङ्खणम्

(1) void of गर्भ and विमर्श, (2) हीननायक, (3) no सूत्रधार, (4) one act, (5) no विष्कम्भक, and प्रवेशक, (6) presence of नियुद्ध and सम्फेट necessary, (7) all वृत्तिs (8) नान्दी and प्ररोचना are sung, in the नेपथ्य

Example same as is given in BP under नर्तनक

SP divides it into नर्तनक and प्रेक्षणक and gives the definition of both as found in ND.

N B BP at P 266 has this

नाट्यप्राय प्रेक्षणक स्यात्प्रहेलिकान्वितम्

which is found in Abh as the definition of प्रेरण, with the v l हास्ये प्राय प्रेरण तु

Remarks on 8 and 9

From the treatment given to these types in ND and SP there seem to have been two varieties of the same type of dramatic entertainment, which were still in a process of being distinguished from one another, but which, however, never happened BP shows a period when both these types were hopelessly mixed up and नर्तनक was losing its individuality SD shows नर्तनक to have been completely superceded and eclipsed by प्रेक्षणक, incorporating elements of both the forms in one

In a MS entitled नाट्यशेखरदीपिका, in the Govt Oriental Library, at B O R I, Poona, a variety of नाट्य called प्रेङ्खण is defined As विश्वनाथ calls प्रेक्षणक

by the name प्रेङ्खण, this प्रेङ्खण, too, may refer to it The definition is this (fol 30, ll. 8–9)

> गीत प्रबन्धा-े नरनारीप्रवर्तितम् ।
> प्रेम्णा गमनोहारि नाट्य प्रेङ्खणमुच्यते ॥

As the general element in प्रेङ्खणक is the playing by men and women in squares etc, this too may refer to the same type

10 हल्लीशम

AP notes it

BP (P 266) Heroine 7, 8, 9 or 10 Act 1 or 2 वृत्ति कैशिकी सधि विमर्श and मुख. Heroes 5 or 6, ललित, दक्षिण and उदात्त, who may be विप्र, क्षत्र, अमात्य or वणिक्

Miscellaneous It should have मुख and अवमर्श when it has two acts and गर्भनिर्गम when it has one act. It should have musical लास्य with श्रुति, स्वर ताल, लय and विधान

Example कलिकेवतक

ND (P 214)

> मण्डलेन नृत्तं स्त्रीणां हल्लीसक तु तद्‍विदु ।
> तत्रैको नेता स्याद्गोपस्त्रीणामिव मुरारि ॥

The same verse is found in BP with रासक for हल्लीसक as the reading

SD (VI, 306–7) Act one, Hero one, clever in speech वृत्ति कैशिकी सधि मुख and निर्वहण Heroine 7, 8, or 10 and बहुताललयस्थिति

11. उल्लोप्यकम

BP (P 266) Act one. सधि void of अवमर्श

रस हास्य, शृङ्गार and करुण Hero and Heroine चतुरोज्ज्वल

Miscellaneous It should have the अङ्गs given under शिल्पक, a song with three divisons called उल्लोप्यक which has been explained as गन्धर्वनिर्णय

Example देवीमाधव उदात्तकुञ्जरम्

SD (VI, 282-3) According to some, there should be four heroines and three acts and बहुल ग्राम

SP does not include this under the group of उपरूपकs

12 काव्य

AP has noted it

BP (P 262) रस हास्य and शृङ्गार वृत्ति all व्रति void of गर्भ and अवमर्श Act one Hero ललितोदात्त, who may be a विप्र, अमात्य or a वणिक् Heroine कुलजा and वेश्या

Miscellaneous It should have भग्नताल, द्विपदी, खण्ड, मात्रा and at times लास्य It should be mixed with विट, चेट and interspersed with talks of joyous ladies and विट etc

Example गौडविजयम् सुग्रीवकेलनम्

ND (P 216) has the following as the definition of काव्य, which in BP has been included under रासक and which again, is recognised by भोज "It should have अभिनय, मात्रा, ध्रुवा, भग्नताल, उपनिषा and भनिता"

ND (VI, 284-5) has this additional वृत्ति except आरभटी, Example यादवोदय

SP divides काव्य into शुद्ध and चित्र It seems that even BP distinguished two types according as (1) the Hero is ललित and उदात्त and heroine कुलजा

and वेश्या and (2) as the hero is a विप्र etc

13 पारिजातकम् or पारिजातलता

BP (P 268) Act one सन्धि मुख and निर्वहण रस, शृङ्गार and वीर Hero देव, धन-उदात्त Heroine. कन्यका or भोगिनी, स्वीय गणिका They may be 8 and 4 and should be expert in दण्डरासक

Miscellaneous वर्णमात्रा, खण्डताल, गाथा three आसारित and चित्रकथा It should be charming at times by the jokes of विदूषक

Example गङ्गातरङ्गिका

14. सल्लापक

BP (P. 256) Plot renowned or imaginary or both रस Erotic and Humourous should not be present here, but a mixture of वीर and रौद्र is allowed other रस may be subordinate. Hero angry, hypocrite, धीरशान्त, trying to meet with the incidents of कापट्य, caused by fate or enemy. वृत्ति सात्वती, आरभटी–वर्जिता Acts three, but it should be full of ताल in the second act. First must have विद्रव and third must have कपट सन्धि four, except प्रतिमुख

SD (VI, 281–2) Acts 4 or 3

Example मायाकापालिकम्

15 शिल्पकम्

BP (P. 257). Acts four वृत्ति four रस except हास्य Hero ब्राह्मण, sometimes a हीनोपनायक too, who may have been connected with श्मशान etc. Heroine. कन्या, पुनर्भू or कन्या born of a ब्राह्मण or क्षत्रिय e g माधव s मालती, कमल s कमलावती.

Miscellaneous There should be the following 17 अंगs उत्कण्ठा, अवहित्थ, प्रयत्न, अशासन, तर्क, संशय, तप, उद्वेग, मौर्ख्य, आलस्य कम्प, अनुगनि विस्मय साधन, उच्छ्वास, आतंक, शून्यता, प्रलोभन, नाट्य, सम्फेट, आश्वास, सन्तोपातिशय, प्रमाद, प्रमद, युक्ति, प्रलोभन, प्रशस्ति

SD (VI, 296–300) रस except हास्य and शान्त

Example कनकावतीमाधव

BP on P 266 has this which is seen in Abh as the definition of विदूषक

"When one describes to a friend, one's husband's haughty conduct and sometimes soft conduct of a धूर्त it is शिल्पक"

16 गोष्ठी

BP (P 256) Act 1 रस, शृङ्गार Heroes 9 or 10, प्राकृतनायकs Heroines 5 or 6, beautiful सन्धि void of गर्भ and अवमर्श, वृत्ति कैशिकी–soft Plot imaginary, not very noble Note the following for its plot

गोपीरतैर्विहरतो गोष्ठबालस्य चेष्टितम् ।
यत् यमलार्जुनदानवनिधनकृत तत् गोष्ठी स्यात् ॥

ND (P 214) has the following

गोष्ठे यत्र विहारतश्चेष्टितमिह कैटभद्विष ।
रिष्टासुरप्रमथनप्रभृति तदिच्छन्ति गोष्ठीति ॥

SD Example रैवतमदनिका

SP has the same verse as seen in BP

17 कल्पवल्ली

BP (P 268) It should have हास्य and शृङ्गार as the रसs, its hero should be उदात्त, उपनायक should be

a पीठमर्द and heroine a वासकसज्जा or अभिसारिका It shoud have मुख, प्रतिमुख and निर्वहण as संधिs Its plot should have उदात्त descriptions

Miscellaneous द्विपदी, खण्ड, रम्या, वासकाल, लयत्रय and the ten elements of लास्य

Example माणिक्यवल्लिका

18 श्रीगदितम

AP has noted it

BP (P 258) Hero renowned वृत्ति भारती संधि void of गर्भ and अविमर्श Act one रस विप्रलम्भप्राय Heroine कुलजा

Miscellaneous It should be full of the word 'श्री' and according to some श्री may sing there sitting

Example क्रीडारसातलम्

SP has the same as BP

19 चित्रक

Abh (P 183)

> सख्या सनाथ भर्तुर्यद्‌द्धत इत्युच्यते ।
> मसृण च क्वचिद्वृत्तेचरिते चित्रकस्तु स ॥

This approaches श्रीगदितम् of BP but BP has this same verse as the definition of प्रस्थानक

20 दुर्मल्लिका, also called मल्लिका

(ND calls it दुर्मिल्लिता)

AP has noted it

BP (P. 267), Heroine प्रौढा and नागरा. Acts 4 संधि void of गर्भ

Miscellaneous चौर्यरत, प्रतिपद love between youthful persons-all these are described in private by a दूतिका, in ग्राम्य manners, she, talking thus, asks for money and getting it, desires for more

N B The first act should be as long as three नाडिकाs, and a विट should act at will therein, in the second विदूषक should act for five नाडिकाs, and in the third पीठमर्द for seven नाडिकाs and in the fourth all the three act for ten नाडिकाs

This is also called मल्लिका, wherein पुरोहित, अमात्य or तापस is described as fallen on bad days This is a क्षुद्रकथा in महाराष्ट्री

SD (VI, 303-305) वृत्ति कैशिकी, and भारती Hero: few, नागर According to SD it should have six heroines in the second act and a नागर should act in the third act

Example बिन्दुमती

SP मतल्लिका of BP is described as a श्रव्यकाव्य in the same verses

KS (P 339) considers this as a prose story and defines it thus

प्रेतमहाराष्ट्रभाषया क्षुद्रकथा गोरोचनाद्भवत्यादिवन्मतल्लिका । यस्यां पुरोहितामात्यतापसादीनां प्रारब्धनिर्वाहे उपहास सापि मतल्लिका ।

In the वृत्ति is quoted the following

तया च क्षुद्रकथा मन्यउी प्रेतमहाराष्ट्रभाषया भवति । गोरोचनेव कार्या सानङ्गवतीवार्केचटिमि । तथाच यस्यामुपहास स्यात्पुरोहितामात्यतापसादीनां प्रारब्धनिर्वाहे सापि हि मतल्लिका भवति ।

21 मल्लिका or मणिकुल्या

BP (P 267) रस शृंगार, वृत्ति कैशिकी Act two, having विदूषक and विट acting in the first and second respectively Plot It should not be clear first but should become so at the end सन्धि void of गर्भ and विमर्श

Miscellaneous It has गाथा द्विपदक रथ्या and तालतन्त्र

> मणिकुल्या जलमिव न लक्ष्यते यत्र पूर्वतो वस्तु ।
> पश्चात्प्रकाशते या सा मणिकुल्येति मन्तव्या ज्ञेया ॥

SP has taken this type as a श्रव्यकाव्य KS (P 339) has this, but considers it a prose story

यस्यां पूर्वं वस्तु न लक्ष्यते पश्चात् प्रकाशते सा मत्स्यहसितादिवन्मणिकुल्या ।

and in the वृत्ति the above verse is quoted

22 विलासिका

SD (VI, 301-2) "It is also called विनायिका by some and included under दुर्मल्लिका by others"

रस शृंगार Act one सन्धि void of गर्भ and अवमर्श Hero हीन Plot sparse and renowned

Miscellaneous It should have ten लास्याङ्ग and विदूषक विट and पीठमर्द

23 ग्रामगेय and प्रेरण

Abh (P 183)

> ग्राम्यगान प्रेरणं तु स्यात्प्रेङ्खितकान्वितम् ।
> चतुर्विधमनुरागं नाकीर्णं तु भावत ॥

NDS has a type of नाट्य which it calls by the name of प्रेरण It is thus defined there (fol 30)

> दीप्तमुण्डनमस्मात्विकृताकारदर्शने ।
> घर्षरायुक्तनथादिविन्यासकुट्टने ॥
> प्रसरणे पार्ष्णिघाते हृदयोतादिवादने ।
> मनोभवप्रेरणया प्रेरण नाट्यमुच्यते ॥

Evidently the two types as recognised by Abh and NDS have a common thread between them दीप्तमुण्डन etc , would create such an appearance of the actor that humour would be excited, which after all, is the essential recognised by Abh

NDS also recognises a type called रामाक्रीड, which has not been described there as its nature is obvious from the word itself May it have anything to do with our रामाक्रीड? It is शम्पागर्भित according to NDS

CHAPTER VII

EVOLUION OF NRTYA-TYPES

CHAPTER VII

EVOLUTION OF NṚTYA-TYPES

AFTER thus collecting details about all these several नृत्य-types, we shall turn to see their development But before doing so, it will be convenient if we tabulate the results of these details The accompanying table shows the details of all these types, at a glance and contains all the important points gathered in the previous chapter, under these individual heads Remarks made in the last two columns of this table will be explained further

The table shows that the types that have been described here have not all developed uniformly Some types show a preponderance of musical elements and others show some dramatic development, though even in this latter case, an alternative description is seen in most cases, indicating their essentially musical nature

It will be seen, for instance that, with the exception of रासक and दुर्मिलिका, all the other forms are very elementary dramatic forms presenting at the same time, an original musical nature रासक seems to have been developed very early and नाट्यरासक seems to be its variant as we shall see further दुर्मिलिका, on the other hand, seems to have developed *from a prose-story to a dramatic form* and it shows several elements which are later seen in नाटक. All the other types reveal a double character. Why

is this so? I think it suggests a gradual development of these types There must have been a time when these types must have existed as नृत्य types, showing dance and music only, without any speech This is further corroborated by the following considerations

We have seen that उपरूपक, a term used for these types by SD, is a very late term, the earlier ones being नृत्यप्रकार and गेयरूपक We have also found that regular रूपक types differed, theoretically, from these नृत्य types in the point that रूपक had speech added to it But the term नृत्यप्रकार and its explanations uniformly presuppose a type of entertainment which had dance and music incorporated into it, but no dialogue This is expressly mentioned by Abh and DR SD is silent about the point and this silence is significant as we shall presently see

From the fact that most of the नृत्य types as detailed above, present an alternate description, thus showing an earlier नृत्य form and a later नाट्य form, it seems that terms नृत्यप्रकार and उपरूपक should not be taken in the same sense Take for instance, the प्रस्थान type of which BP has preserved three alternate descriptions, while the descriptions of Abh, ND and SD each, show some distinct features It will be marked that whereas the descriptions of Abh, ND and the first type of BP are purely musical showing no details about act, संधि etc, BP's second type is a नृत्य form showing details regarding act, संधि रस etc, and BP's third type shows that it is a further evolved form of

BP's second type, as this third type shows two acts as against one in the second type and details about hero etc, which are absent in the second SD's description tallies with BP's third type but shows some variations as regards heroine and वृत्ति. Now all these types of प्रस्थानक have been taken by BP as नृत्यप्रकार's while SD considers its type as an उपरूपक What is the necessity of making this change in the terminology? It seems that those types that are taken by SD as उपरूपकs once existed as merely musical types i e as forms of entertainment in which there was अभिनय, music and dance but no dialogue. Later on these same types developed an elementary dramatic character, which added dialogue to the earlier type These earlier types may have embodied some story, but the whole story, it seems, was composed in songs, which were sung in musical accompaniment with appropriate histrionics There seems to be some evidence for this supposition The earlier definitions of these नृत्यप्रकारs as given by Abh and as found in BP, show that in these types some sort of episodes were to be sung Abh's definiton of सैन्धव requires that the dancer should attract the mind of the king by speeches pregnant with love-suggestions द्विगूढक of Abh would afford greater opportunity for embodying some sort of story-like episode, as in it the heroine describes before her friend the terrible manners of her husband or the graceful acts of a धूर्त As a matter of fact, these are treated by अभिनय as distinct from नृत्त types These same

types, as their names and descriptions in BP and other works suggest, developed into नृत्य types when probably a continuous story in songs, was acted before the audience These were purely नृत्य types But side by side with these, रूपक types were also developing and as a reflection of the रूपकs, these नृत्य types borrowed speech and transformed themselves into some sort of half-developed रूपकs, which in विश्वनाथ's age, came to be regarded as उपरूपकs That these नृत्य types had no speech seems fairly certain by the term गेयरूपक as distinguished from the term पाठ्यरूपक as used by हेमचन्द्र Thus it seems that terms नृत्यप्रकार or गेयरूपक and उपरूपक do not denote the same thing The earlier type was void of speech which the later type added on and then the earlier distinction that नृत्य type could create only भाव and नाट्य type रस, was given up Naturally the sort of उपरूपक known to SD (descriptions of all the types as given by SD are dramatic in nature, not a single type showing a musical character) and represented to-day by उन्मत्तराघव (a प्रेक्षणक) or दानकेलिकौमुदी (a भाणिका) or सुभद्रहरण (a श्रीगदितम्) have very little to distinguish themselves from the ordinary रूपक types But this should not appear strange, as these later उपरूपकs, though they are based on the earlier नृत्य types, show a reflection (as has been suggested above) of the ordinary रूपक types, which must have influenced them greatly

Let us now survey all the उपरूपकs and see their interrelations as well as their relations with the regular रूपक types I have already mentioned

more than once that my main thesis in this volume is to prove a gradual evolution of our Drama i e of रूपक from the उपरूपक and of उपरूपक from the नृत्त types In considering the general development of the रूपकs, we have taken the भाण type to be the most primitive, out of which other types have evolved I shall deal with the point more elaborately when I come to discuss the origin of our Drama, but for the present, I wish to point out that as in the case of रूपक, so too, in the case of नृत्य types, भाण seems to be the most primitive type Our lists show that both भाण and भाणिका have been recognised as उपरूपक, and that डोम्बिका, an उपरूपक, is a variant of भाणिका Both Abh and BP have given a terrible charater to भाण, in which violent movements of limbs are prescribed, while BP's भाणिका, which in essence is the same as Abh's डोम्बिका, has been pronounced as a gentle type Of course, to SD only भाणिका with its graceful features, is known The terrible भाण is a matter of bye-gone period in SD's age[1] Thus it seems that in very primitive stage भाण had been recognised in two distinct aspects, one the trerrible, being represented by भाण and the other the gentle, represented by भाणिका On these two types–terrible and gentle–all the other उप-रूपकs(नृत्य-types)[2], I think, are based Abh's classifica-

1 This will explain the above-mentioned silence of SD as in i's age no such dis'inc'ion exis'ed in prac'ice

2 Keith in his *Sanskrit Drama* describes the उपरूपकs at P 351. On reading his description of the उपरूपकs, it will be seen tha' he too considers them as musical only but he has not dis'inguished between नृत्त and नृत्य types. clearly

tion of the types mentioned by him, as उद्धत, मसृण and their combinations, preserves this principle, which seems to be fairly old, from Abh's quotation itself Our रस can be classified as suitable to the उद्धत or the मसृण type All our दीप्तरस-i e वीर, रौद्र, भयानक and बीभत्स-are suitable for the उद्धत type, and शृङ्गार, हास्य and करुण are, by their very nature, gentle, while अद्भुत may be taken as a mixed type If we bear this distinction in mind, we shall find all the उपरूपकs as conforming to the उद्धत or gentle type, the first being represented by भाण उपरूपक and the second by भाणिका उपरूपक It is on this understanding that in the foregoing table, I have characterised each of the varieties as मसृण or उद्धत All मसृण types can be traced to भाणिका and all उद्धत types can be traced to भाण (उद्धत) This I shall now proceed to show by a detailed analysis of the नृत्य types (In so doing, I shall call the भाण of BP as the उद्धत भाण type and भाणिका of BP as the मसृण भाण type)

डोम्बी, it will be seen, is a mere variant of the मसृण भाण type

रासक and नाट्यरासक present the following features five characters, various languages, उत्तरोत्तर and वीथ्यङ्ग One view wants 16, 12 or 8 heroines शृङ्गार has been considered prominent in this type लास्याङ्गs too, are allowed All these features point to a मसृण type and many heroines, उत्तरोत्तर and लास्याङ्गs liken these types to भाणिका type, which is मसृण Though as a नृत्त type रासक might have been very primitive, as it is, in one way or the other, connected with कृष्ण's

गर्भ[3], as an उपरूपक it seems to go with the नाटिका type. प्रस्थानक, with its charming sports and drinks, वीर and शृङ्गार as रस and दास, चेट and विट as heroes, is a नाट्य-मिश्र type, leaning more towards the नाट्य भाण type It shows some further development, as BP's *third type and SD's type show two acts* प्रेक्षणक with its one act, but with no definite instructions about रस, is a semi-नाट्य type and as such a mere variant of नर्तनक as has been actually pointed out in BP As a matter of fact, नर्तनक (a purely musical type). प्रेङ्खणक[4] (a half-developed नाट्य type) and प्रस्थानक (an उपरूपक) are all inter-connected and all can be reduced to the above नाट्य भाण type

हल्लीश, with many heroes and many heroines, being reminiscent of the रासक and नाट्यरासक, shows clearly an affinity with नाट्य भाण type particularly in view of SD's injunction that it should have one hero clever in speech, which would apply to our भाण नायक, which itself is a नाट्य type

उल्लोप्यक seems to be a mixed type, leaning more on the नाट्य side, as all the रस prescribed by BP show but SD's injunction that according to some, it should have बहुमगम makes it a mixed type.

काव्य is a नाट्य type but one from which, our प्रकरण has evolved The features that it should have विप्र or अमात्य or वणिक् as a hero, that its heroine

3 See Note A at the end of this chapter

4 प्रेङ्खणक according to SD having no सूत्रधार etc but having नियुद्ध and संफेट is a नृत्य type and as such may be the original of नाट्येय type

may be a कुलजा or a वेश्या and that हास्य and शृङ्गार may prevail there, are also the distinguishing elements of प्रकरण, which, however, is very complicated and elaborate on account of its ten acts, while भाण्य is an elementary type with its one act

पारिजातकम्, which has been recognised only by BP and which presents the features of having a noble hero, वीर and शृङ्गार रस, eight to four heroines essentially suited to शृङ्गार and the दण्डरासक dance, shows a predominant मसृण character, only the वीर gives it a mixed colour

सल्लापक is almost a complete रूपक type as described by BP as well as SD (It is therefore, not very strange that भगवदज्जुकम् should include it in the list of its ten रूपकs) A close scrutiny reveals its resemblance with समवकार As a matter of fact, there is very little ground to distinguish it from समवकार as far as the theory goes Its plot must be renowned or imaginary or mixed, it can have three to four acts, its hero should be angry or पाषण्ड, trying to meet with कपटयुद्ध and there must be ताल, विद्रव and कपट in the different acts All these are the features which a समवकार may well have, only that समवकार with its regulated duration of time and acts is a more conventionalised and complicated form Both सल्लापक and समवकार, however, belong to the उद्धत भाण type as their very basis is on दीप्त रस

शिल्पक, with its रस other than हास्य and शृङ्गार and a secondary hero connected with cremation ground, evinces clearly an उद्धत type, which is corro-

borated by Abh's description of त्रिगूढक (same verse is seen in BP as an alternative definition of सिन्धक) according to which a dancer sings of the haughty deeds of her husband Of course a gentle touch is allowed, but उद्धत seems to be the primary feature This, too, is a somewhat developed type with its four acts and 27 अङ्गs, but it is rather difficult to indicate its connection with any of the later रूपकs

गोष्ठी is essentially a मसृण type Its nine or ten heroes who should be प्राकृत, five or six beautiful heroines, erotic रस, soft कैशिकी and भारती वृत्तिs, and imaginary but not very noble plot, preserve enough elements to show its affinity with the मसृण भाग type That this form is very primitive and represents one of the cow-herd dances of कृष्ण, is clear from the verse quoted in ND and others, though that verse shows some terrible element

कल्पवल्ली with its हास्य and शृङ्गार, with its विट and पीठमर्द, with its वासकसज्जा or अभिसारिका heroine, approximates the मसृण भाग type

श्रीगदितम् with its famous hero and plot, and prominent विप्रलम्भ seems to be a mixed type, though it does not show any उद्धत element Its कुलजा heroine and विप्रलम्भ रस are quite distinct features.

दुर्मल्लिका of which मल्लिका and विलासिका are the obvious variants, has been pronounced as a क्षुद्रकथा, and the fact that it has evolved out of a prose-story, is enough to distinguish it from all other varieties Of course, the लास्याङ्गs prescribed in the case of विलासिका and नेपथ्यशृङ्गार in the case of मल्लिका, make it

approach the मसृण type, while the ग्राम्य manners of दूती in दुर्मल्लिका and विदूषक and विट in मल्लिका show their coarser nature

रासाक्रीड and प्रेरण have never reached the उपरूपक stage, they remained mere dances

The above analysis will show that in most cases there are very few distinguishing marks In fact, the ground of distinction in each case is very meagre and very often one variety may be mixed up with the other हल्लीशक, for instance, has very little to distinguish itself from रासक, with which it is often confounded गोष्ठी again has almost nothing to preserve its individuality It is akin to भाणिका and रासक In fact, भाणिका, रासक[5], हल्लीशक and गोष्ठी–all these four seem to have an equal right to antiquity and thus to be regarded as primitive dance-types It is likely that these four are the later distinctions of one original dance but it is very difficult at this date, from the scanty data that we possess to point out the original type We must be satisfied for the present, by pointing out similarities and points of affinity From this viewpoint, these four essentially represent one type But for reasons of convenience and others that I shall point out later I take भाणिका to represent the original type Thus we will have two original नृत्य types–one gentle type represented by BP's भाणिका and the other a terrible type represented by BP's भाण , and we have

5 See Note B at the end of this chapter

6 On comparing the dramaturgical structure of our भाणक

seen above the possibility of reducing all the known उपरूपकs to one or the other of these two types

with these four it will be seen that हल्लीशक when it developed into the नाट्य type had nothing to distinguish itself from भाण्य कथक हल्लीशक according to SD has one hero clever in speech (which would suggest his resorting to आकाशभाषित) and many heroines which is essentially the nature of later भाण्य कथक गोष्ठी too according to SD has many heroines etc, which feature is prsent in भाणकपक Thus रासक नाट्यरासक, भाणिका गोष्ठी and हल्लीशक have all contributed to the final nature of भाणकपक There is however one point which is very important in this connection I think that the name भाण is etymologically significant It denotes a distinct element of speech into it and bearing this in mind, I think it to be likely that गोष्ठी हल्लीशक and रासक as नृत्य forms were earlier to evolve than भाण or भाणिका but when dialogue was first added to the elements already present in the नृत्य forms their combined evolute came to be known as भाण Thus as an उपरूपक form भाण was the first to evolve

Note A—On रास and रासक

रास to-day has been considered a peculiarity of the Gujarati ladies We shall see further that there are reasons to believe that this रास first originated in सौराष्ट्र This रास dance as it is played to-day by the Gujarati ladies consists of several types, many of which are modern innovations by the present artists but the underlying form is undoubtedly very old Several ladies in appropriate garbs turning round a central object (in certain cases the object might be absent) sing some song mostly pertaining to कृष्ण's sports with गोपीs in *accompaniment with beating drums, which would be helpful* to them in keeping time They go round and the movements vary according to the sentiment of the song and it may be that even in one and the same song the vari-

ations in movement may be effected, when the sentiment, in the poem takes a marked turn The whole process becomes very charming and has already earned sincere appreciations from the lovers of art, all over India A variation of the above practice occurs when males and females both take part in the dance, which originally represented कृष्ण and गोपी, the feature being known to the Sanskrit Dramaturgists in the following old verse, very often quoted as the definition of हल्लीसक or रासक

यन्मण्डलेन नृत्तं स्त्रीणां हल्लीसकं तु तत्माहु ।
तत्रैको नेता स्याद्गोपस्त्रीणामिव मुरारि ॥

That this practice seems to be very old is apparent from its being connected with कृष्ण s dance जयदेव in रासे हरिरिह सरसविलासम् etc , preserves the knowledge of the practice it is evidently known to भागवत

Of course in कृष्ण s time it must have existed only as a नृत्त form, as its remnant the रास of Gujrat shows That it was a very favourable pastime for the young people seems to be true for it has been very often described as attracting the गोपिs of व्रज and many a devotee of कृष्ण has hankered after the enjoyment of this रास The Gujarati devotee नरसिंह मेहता in the fifteenth century has a legend woven round him that he actually witnessed the रास in कृष्ण s heaven and that he was standing in the centre of the circle with a torch in his hand and was absorbed so much in the spectacle that he became unconscious of the flames reaching down to his hand and burning it till कृष्ण himself saw and remedied it All these popular legends and stories prove the immense popularity of this form of dance and its sanctity by its association with कृष्ण That नाट्यरासक may well have been a later evolute is possible as its very name suggests though there is evidence of its having existed as a mere dance form as the theory attests But that रासक in its origin was an elementary dance form is almost certain and does not require any further reference A

variation of this रास is what is popularly called दाण्डिक रास which is the same as दण्डरासक occurring under प्रेक्षणकम् in BP P 263

Very often on account of similarity of sound रास is connected with the word रस and is even derived from it. But this derivation is not scientific. In very primitive times the theory of रस was not known and even otherwise as a dance form रास or रासक can have nothing to do with रस it cannot even create रस in the minds of the spectators as the theory points out very well रास is thus not to be derived from रस but from रस् a root which means to cry aloud which may refer to the very primitive form of this dance when the proportion of artistic movements and music may not have been still realised and when it must have been practised as a wild dance

Note B–On रासक and लास्य

There is some evidence to connect रासक with लास्य It may be that both are identical terms. रासक is once actually called लास्य Again रास the direct remnant of रासक is to-day seen in सौराष्ट्र only And there are positive statements showing that लास्य first originated in सौराष्ट्र Govt Oriental Library at B O R I at Poona possesses three mss. on नृत्त and in all these three the above tradition is referred to भरतार्णव a treatise believed to be composed by the famous author of अभिनयदर्पण नन्दिकेश्वर (Dr De believes this to be a version of the original abridged by one सुमति See Sanskrit Poetics I 2n) has the following (fol 66)

> लास्यमस्याग्रतः प्रीता पार्वती समदीदिशत् ।
> बुद्ध्वा तु ताण्डवं तस्मात् मर्त्येभ्यो मुनयेऽवदत् ॥
> पार्वती त्वनुशास्ति स्म लास्यं बाणात्मजामुषाम् ।
> तया द्वारवतीगोप्यस्ताभिः सौराष्ट्रयोषितः (? योषितः)।
> ताभिस्तु शिक्षिता नार्यो नाना जनपदास्पदाः ।
> एवं परम्परायातं लोके लास्यं प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥

Another MS संगीतमुक्तावली composed by one देवेन्द्र a court poet of

Jam Sattarsal (c 1574 A D) has the following (fol 57, 1 15)

ताण्डुना ताण्डव
स्वैर दर्शयति स्म खण्डपरशु प्रीत्या स्वय कल्पितम्
—बाणसुताप्युषा गिरिसुता शिक्षापयामास ता
सापि द्वारवतीगता कुलवधू सौराष्ट्रनारी च सा
नानादेशसमुद्भवा प्रियतमा शिक्षापिता तत्परम्
सौराष्ट्रीयवधूजनेन भुवि तज्जात प्रसिद्ध क्रमात्

I have filled in some lacunae seen in this MS, from another MS of रसकौमुदी at G O I, by the kind courtsey of Mr M R Majmudar

NSD has the following (fol 15 1 4 6)

गोविन्दस्य च पार्थाय प्रायच्छदुन्दुर्नैतवाहन
उषायै कन्यकायै च सोषा गोपीभ्य एव च
गोप्यासौराष्ट्रयोषिद्भ्यो नर्तकेभ्यश्च ता स्त्रिय
एव परम्पराप्राप्त नर्तकस्य निरूपकम्

Also compare SR VII, 6 8 All these references show that लास्य is connected with सौराष्ट्र So too is रास This is one more point for connecting रासक with लास्य

CHAPTER VIII
THE ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

THE ORIGIN OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

MANY attempts have been made, ere now, to fix the exact nature of the origin of our drama, but as yet none seems to have gained general acceptance The controversy regarding the religious versus secular origin of our drama has occupied the minds of many scholars, but evidence that is brought to bear upon the subject, while far from reliable is wholly indirect and as such fails to carry conviction So far as we have the knowledge of definite references to drama, all goes well but beyond that is the realm of conjectures and conclusions are drawn from scanty materials To examine a ritualistic ceremony from a ब्राह्मण and investigate into the practice of its performance or to search for the nature of the monlogues and dialogues in the ऋग्वेद with reference to the mode of their recitation, without any definite guide, is to my mind a procedure far from scientific Our European scholars are loathe to find any reference to the art of Dramatics in पाणिनि and yet they would jump at Rgvedic ages for the origin of drama But this is not all They have other lines of attack They catch hold of one word here and one word there and build ingenious theories on these sandy foundations, only to be pulled down by another equally sandy theory The word शैलूष or शौभिक or ग्र, detached

from actual drama and dramatic theory can lead us no where All these attempts, therefore, to my mind, are round about and as such bound to remain unconvincing

In order to arrive at some definite idea about the character of our earliest drama, I think that we must study the dramatic theory as expounded in our dramaturgical works, and it is in this manner that I take up this consideration of the origin of our drama

My study of Sanskrit dramaturgy has led me to believe in the gradual development of our नाट्य types from the नृत्य types, which in their turn evolved from the primitive नृत्त types[1] We have seen how, amongst the रूपकs, all the types are likely to have evolved from the भाण रूपक, as also how from amongst the उपरूपकs almost all the types could be reduced to the उद्धत भाण or मसृण भाणिका type I have now to point out that there runs a common relationship between the रूपकs, and the उपरूपकs as far as their mutual evolution is concerned

Usually our extant भाण रूपक has a विट who goes out on some business, passes through the वेशवाट, converses with a number of hetaerae and attains his object This means that there were many heroines in a भाण Our earliest भाणs are those that


1 It is not very difficult to show that the terms designating the various उपरूपकs once designated some sort of dance forms or some sort of नाट्यांग, But it is a thesis which I reserve for future treatment

are published in चतुर्भाणी Out of these four, धूर्तविटसंवाद (whose peculiar character I have already noted) has seven such betaerae, पादताडितकम् has about sixteen, पद्मप्राभृतकम् fourteen and उभयाभिसारिका eight This means that from the first our भाणs had many heroines, and, though it is possible, in the case of some of the भाणs, to point out one particular hetaera in whom the chief विट is interested and who may therefore be called the heroine proper yet the general nature of this type percludes only one heroine So too in some of our existing भाणs we have more than one hero, often three or four. Thus this मल्लिक has many heroes and many heroines, it is erotic in its very essence, though वीर and अद्भुत are suggested but that was in accordance with the later, not with the earlier theory. This nature of भाण corresponds with the nature of भाणिका, which is मसृण, which shows nine or ten threads of the plot (i e many heroes and heroines) and which has erotic as the pervading रस The theory requires इतिवृत्त to be woven in भाणिका and there is a curious coincidence in मुकुन्दानन्द भाण where the chief विट is identified with कृष्ण and the whole play develops in this double character (But I do not want to suggest that this was the essential part of भाण रूपक, for it was not) All these points of similarity show that our मसृण भाणिका उपरूपक is the original, from which the रूपक भाण has drawn most of its elements अकालमन्वित has been probably taken from the नन्दिनादि type which is the उद्धत भाण type Thus भाणिका gave rise to भाण रूपक and this in its

turn developed into वीथी, अङ्क and प्रहसन Thus out of the five one-act dramas, four are to be connected with the मसृण भाणिका, while the remaining one-act type व्यायोग which shows दीप्त रस may be traced to the उद्धत भाण type, and from व्यायोग have been developed the other दीप्त types as has already been pointed out Thus there runs a common thread through all the known रूपकs and उपरूपकs

With this may be connected the universally acknowledged tradition that नृत्त, in its origin, was divided into उद्धत and मसृण types, the first being called ताण्डव and the other लास्य and with great plausibility we can trace, in their ultimate forms, our उद्धत types to ताण्डव नृत्त and the मसृण types to लास्य Following Abh's classification of मसृण and उद्धत and their mixture we have already tried to reduce all the नृत्य types to these classes It is further possible to reduce all our रूपकs also to one of these types भाण, वीथी and प्रहसन, with their mild erotic रसs and gentle elements like लास्याङ्गs are मसृण समवकार, ईहामृग, डिम and व्यायोग with their haughty रसs are clearly उद्धत अङ्क with its करुणरस is mild Of course a variation may occur wherein more than one रस may be employed in one and the same type As a matter of fact these रूपकs, as we know them to-day being highly individualised and developed afford great scope for a mixture of रसs But we may call a type मसृण or उद्धत according as it has a mild or haughty रस predominant नाटक and प्रकरण are mostly mixed, though even here it will be possible to point out one particular रस to be promi-

nent. It is thus that we can trace all our dramatic, semi-dramatic, and musical forms to their ultimate two forms—ताण्डव and लास्य Here then, the tradition has its fullest justification and provides a key to the history of the evolution of our dramas If now we tabulate the results of our investigations we shall get the following table



The above table clearly shows the inter-relations of all the known रूपक्स and उपरूपक्स, and the

2 These numbers refer to the serial numbers in the table attached at the beginning of the previous Chapter.

possibility of their being reduced to the ultimate dance forms-ताण्डव and लास्य भाणिका with its many variant like रासक, नाट्यरासक, हल्लीशक, गोष्ठी etc, was the first to evolve as a नृत्य type, while भाण रूपक was the first to evolve as a रूपक type

But it may be asked what claims has this भाण रूपक to be taken as the first dramatic form to evolve? Why should we not take वीथी or प्रहसन or अङ्क or व्यायोग as the original type? There are considerations which force us to take भाण as the first evolute of the रूपक type Let us study the plot-structure of our extant भाणs Of course the theory is very vague when it prescribes that one विट should describe vile incidents experienced by himself or by others, for this gives a vast latitude to the poet, and makes the character of भाण episodic That is, a भाण will never have a continuous story to develop, but only detached incidents which are patched up together in some interesting manner This characteristic of भाण is fully preserved in the actual भाणs that we possess to-day Not a single भाण militates against this, as the following analysis shows

शृङ्गारभूषण has been pronounced as typical of the class, and as the earliest भाण known to us with the exception of चतुर्भाणी In this भाण the chief विट, विलासशेखर starts to partake in the festivities celebrated in the honour of अनङ्गमञ्जरी, the daughter of कनक-मञ्जरी, a hetaera, on her attaining puberty On the way, he passes through the वेशवाट and meets with a number of other hetaerae, indulges in smart

conversation with them and finally reaches अनङ्गमञ्जरी's place. He thus converses with thirteen गणिकाs on the way, five of whom are introduced with their spouses Thus there are thirteen or fourteen incidents, and the विट does not forget to describe ram-fight, cock-fight, boxing and different stages of the day

In शृङ्गारतिलक, "भुजङ्गशेखर, the hero, is vexed at the departure of his beloved हेमाङ्गी, but is assured of meeting her again, despite her return to her husband He makes the usual promenade in the hetaerae's street, has the usual imaginary[3] conversations and describes the ordinary sights, including snake-charmers and magic shows of gods and their mountains and so forth Finally he succeeds in rejoining हेमाङ्गी" The above is the main incident of the भाण, but it has some minor threads too, मन्दारक, a friend of the hero, had an adventure with a चित्रसेन, with whose wife he had been on terms of intimacy, and he describes his experiences a* some length Then the hero goes through the

3 This is not the proper word, for though when the विट converses with the hetaerae on the stage there is no other actor present on the stage and so far the conversation may seem imaginary, yet as far as the plot is concerned all this is supposed to be real It is only the simpler and more primitive dramatic technique of भाण which lends it the character of an imaginary talk otherwise neither from the viewpoint of the विट nor from the viewpoint of the audience is the conversation meant to be imaginary and the whole interest centres round the unseen characters who are, to all intents and purposes real

वेशवाट and about fifteen incidents are described and then he sees his friend कन्दुंसक, to whom he narrates his experiences with हेमाङ्गी Thus this भाण too shows a number of incidents

शृङ्गारसर्वस्व is a variant of the above भाण, for in it the hero, अनङ्गशेखर, being separated from his beloved कनकलता, goes in a dejected mood through the वेशवाट and converses with about thirteen hetaerae He then meets his friend कमन्दक, who describes his love-affair with an unknown lady in details, and finally the hero attains his desire

रससदन, which makes more pleasant reading, has a chief विट as the hero, who has promised his friend मन्दारक to look after his wife in his absence He goes about with her to a temple and then to his own house, after escorting the lady to her own abode But soon he comes out, wanders in the street, talks and describes at large and finally after accepting the invitation of a lady from a neighbouring town to pay her a visit, goes back home to find the lovers united There are about *fourteen incidents in this play*

मुकुन्दानन्द is one of the lengthiest भाणs, in which the hero, भुजङ्गशेखर, indentifying himself with कृष्ण, describes in double entendres his adventures with various hetaerae. He being separated from his beloved, wanders about and meets his friend वसन्तक who is running away from one कमलापीड, with whose wife he had passed that night He describes his amour with the lady at some length About

fifteen incidents are described and then once more comes a friend of the hero कन्दुसक, who describes his experiences in minute details with one कल्लिनी Some more incidents are also seen grouped together making in all twenty threads

This shows that our भाण had no one continuous plot, but a series of unconnected incidents, described one after the other This feature is seen in our earlier भाणs too In उभयाभिसारिका, the earliest[4] extant भाण, the विट is requested to reconcile the love-quarrel arisen between कुबेरदत्त, the son of समुद्रदत्त and नारायणदत्ता, and he, starting for

4 That these four भाणs are earlier than all the other known भाणs, is obvious by the fact that पद्मप्राभृतकम् and धूर्तविटसंवाद are referred to by writers in the tenth and eleventh centuries and पद्मप्राभृतकम् by दण्ड in the sixth century while there is no reason why उभयाभिसारिका should not be assigned to वररुचि whose name is actually found in the colophon to the work. The भाण itself bears at least two marks to vouchsafe its antiquity The विट who is here called वैशिकाचल, meets on his way a परिव्राजिका who does not seem to be a Buddhist nun but a follower of some Brahmanic system, probably of वैशेषिक, as otherwise 'मते वैशेषिकाख्येन' would be out of place Further on she remarks

षट्पदार्थव्युत्पन्ने सामान्यसमवाय गुहमे प्रविष्टुम्।

Now we know that the later वैशेषिक theory acknowledged seven पदार्थs but the earlier कणादs allowed only six to which अभाव was added later on by the time of शिवादित्य (Compare Keith Atomic Theory P 180 also Radhakrishnan Indian Philosophy II P 195) This will put the date of this play considerably earlier than the 10th century Again there is a statement (in the play) which enumerates the different भाणs thus (P 13)

the purpose, passes through the street of hetaerae, converses with seven or eight of them and finally learns from the maid of नारायणदत्ता that the lovers had reunited, for, both of them being put in psychologically anxious mood, set out to meet one

> यस्यास्तावत्प्रथम रूपश्रीनवयौवनद्युतिकान्त्यादिना गुणाना सम्पत्
> चतुर्विधाभिनयसिद्धि द्वात्रिंशद्विधो हस्तप्रचार अष्टादशविध निरीक्षण
> षट् स्थानानि गतिद्वय (त्रय) अष्टौ रसा त्रयो गीतवादित्रादिलया
> इत्येवमादीनि नृत्ताङ्गानि त्वदाश्रयेणालङ्कृतानि ।

This distinctly enumerates 4 kinds of अभिनय, 32 kinds of हस्तप्रचार, 18 kinds of निरीक्षणम्, 6 स्थानs, 2 gaits, 8 रसs, and 3 गीतवादित्र etc Out of these 4 kinds of अभिनय and 8 रसs are acknowledged by all while 6 स्थानs (of पात्रs) are pres cribed by भरत *But about the rest, NS has 64 kinds of* हस्तप्रचार (संयुत 13 असंयुत 24 नृत्तहस्तs 27—64) and 36 kinds of दृष्टि is against 32 हस्तप्रचारs and 18 निरीक्षणs in this drama This too may point to an early period when भरतs treatise was not taken as authoritative

Judged from this point of view this drama seems to belong to an early date

That पद्मप्राभृतकम् reveals traits of a style similar to that of the author of मृच्छकटिक is borne out by some internal evidence On P 10 is described one पवित्रक as

> राजमार्गाद्विदितजनसम्पर्शं परिहरन्निव समृहीतार्द्रवसन सङ्कुचितसर्वाङ्गो
> नासिकाद्वयमङ्गुलिद्वयेन पिधाय चत्वरशिवशीतिकामाश्रित्य स्थित

This trick it will be seen, is utilised in मृच्छकटिक, in the case of शर्विलक Same trick is once more resorted to in this drama with regard to शैविलक (P 15) Both these dramas—मृच्छकटिक and पद्मप्राभृतकम्—show a period when Buddhism was definitely ridiculed These points together with the fact that this drama is referred to by बाण in the sixth century places it fairly early मूलदेव with whom the plot of the play starts seems to have been a renowned figure in ancient India (cf ND 119 also IHQ VII 3)

another and are reconciled In शूद्रक's पद्मप्राभृतकम्, the विट is requested by his friend मूलदेव who was also called कर्णीपुत्र, to bring about his reconciliation with देवसेना, with whom some sort of misunderstanding was created And the विट, who seems to be called शश, boasting to be the friend of मूलदेव, who was a great मदनाचार्य, goes about the town and converses with five or six persons aquainted with him and with ten or eleven hetaerae Then he goes to देवदत्ता and by clever strategical speech manages to eke out the information that she loved मूलदेव In धूर्तविटसंवाद, incidents are very few—only seven In पादताडितकम् a विट recieves the information that a सौराष्ट्रिकविष्णुनाग had been kicked by a गणिका and for the expiation of this pollution a committee was appointed on which the विट in question was taken as a member He wanders, narrates some seventeen incidents and finally attends the meeting which has already prescribed a प्रायश्चित्त for विष्णुनाग Thus all our भाणs, without an exception, are very peculiar in having no plot, but a series of incidents This, then, is a distinct feature of भाण, and one not being present in any other रूपक type (समवकार has a feature like this but the incidents are detached there in respect of the various acts, not in one and the same act) shows an extremely primitive character.

Another characteristic in which भाण is to be distinguished from the other रूपक types is its monologous nature Strictly speaking a monologue is likely to be dry and utterly incapable of developing the plot and it is for this reason

that the device known as आकाशभणित is resorted to by the Sanskrit actors This makes it possible for the poet to introduce other characters, who though not actually present on the stage, are depicted as talking to the only one actor, the विट This monologous character of भाण needs an expert actor to play the role of विट, but at the same time dispenses away with almost all the theatrical accessories for an audience who can imagine the character and the conversations reperesented as taking place between them, as real, can certainly visualise the scenes and other devices Theatre, in very primitive times must have been some *open space, converted for the time being into* some sort of stage and such a stage cannot boast of a रङ्ग and a नेपथ्यगृह and a रङ्गपीठ and a रङ्गशीर्ष and such other accessories Such a theatre, void of almost all the theatrical accessories[5], must have rendered necessary the outcome of a form of entertainment such as is represented by भाण Even a casual glance through any published भाण would show its extremely poor dramatic technique As to the stage-directions there are very few and these too are of a very elementary character Most of the *effect is* created by descriptions, which as we

5 And in later times when our drama grew into a full fledged नाटक, our theatre, though not a mere open space remained comparatively poor as regards these theatrical devices It is however possible that when our drama grew to its fullest height, these devices were provided for in some manner or the other See my paper Hindu Theatre IHQ vol VIII, 480 ff

shall soon see is another characteristic peculiar to भाण That the monologous nature of भाण requires an expert actor would at once be realised He was the only actor and he had to represent various emotions and moods experienced by the different characters and also diffrent situations through which these characters passed That such a monologue may well have been very primitive on account of its popular nature has been suggested more than once[6]

In spite of the peculiar device of आकाशभाषित invented by the Sanskrit actor for relieving the monotony which would be produced by an absolute soliloquy (to which character our भाणs would be reduced if this device is not resorted to,) our भाणs realy lack in smart and varied dialogue. As a matter of fact there is very little of a real type of dramatic dialogue in the भाण Dialogue in भाण is forced and artificial and presents itself in the peculiar form of descriptions These भाणs are all descriptive in essence, and this is a very natural consequence of the monologue A poet writing a भाण can never afford to lose an opportunity to describe Not only is it that he has to describe

6 Out of the theorists शारदातनय gives it a popular character in which he follows his guru दिवाकर who remarks (P 225) that this type is mostly for the diversion of the ordinary people (कुतूहल) Keith too acknowleges the primitive character of this type "The monologue भाण has also an obviously popular character and origin " (*Sanskrit Drama* P 349)

various scenes like ram-fight or wrestling or sunset or sunrise or beauty of the dawn, but even in the dialogue between the chief विट and the hetaerae, where would appear the fullest latitude for the poet to break the fetters of this limitation, an essentially descriptive nature prevails The poet would describe either the beauty of the lady or her sports or her various moods and where description is not present our भाणs at once assume a narrative form which is sure to bring lengthy descriptions in its train Take up any भाण and this will be borne out The usual भाण would begin with a विट describing the effects of dawn and early activities of the people Then he would describe the वेशवाट and then would follow the various descriptions of sports etc, of the ladies He may often meet a friend on the way and then the friend will enter into a narrative of his experiences with some ladies Then he would pass from the street of the hetaerae and on the way would describe the cock-fight etc It is thus clear that the भाण was by nature descriptive

Though the theory is not clear, there appears sufficient grounds to believe that भाण was usually composed in Sanskrit only, as against the varied languages in all the other types of रूपकs All our भाणs prove this to the hilt, and inspite of the fact that some of our later भाणs have introduced Prakrit at certain places, it seems that in the earlier भाणs Sanskrit was the rule Out of the four भाणs in चतुर्भाणी, only पादताडितकम् has used

Prakrit and that too only twice in the course of the whole play, which is certainly very lengthy for a one-act drama. And the way in which Prakrit is used in these later भाणs shows that it was a novel experiment on their part owing to the influence of the रूपकs which had certainly fully developed then. It therefore seems to be quite possible that Prakrit had no place in our original भाणs, but later writers being under the strong influence of conventional models of the other रूपकs tried to introduce this feature in the भाणs. This point naturally leads to another consideration. In भाण the actual actor on the stage, before the eyes of the audience was विट only, and though he conversed with various hetaerae and also with persons naturally belonging to a lower strata of the society, it was he who repeated their speeches. In such cases the plot had enough opportunities to introduce the Prakrit, if that was the established convention. But, if our above suggestin is correct, भाण was the earliest dramatic form to evolve and at that date no precise convention had sprung up with regard to the use of various languages. Our theory is elaborate about the use of languages by various characters, and विट, who is the onl) actor in a भाण appears to have been allowed Sanskrit in earlier days, but was restricted to प्राकृत in later days. NS in describing a विट does not give any injunction about the language to be used by him, but BP expressly describes him as प्राकृतभाषी. Out of our earliest

dramas, other than भाणs, चारुदत्त and मृच्छकटिक have a विट as a character, and in both these, he speaks in Sanskrit only In नागानन्दम् which is the only other drama in which a विट figures, Prakrit is resorted to by him This is conclusive enough to show that विट was allowed Sanskrit in earlier days विट is always described as a man of accomplishment, a man of town, a नागरक, and it is quite compatible with this character of his that he is allowed the use of Sanskrit If this be true i e if the विट was allowed Sanskrit, a form of drama like भाण, in which he alone figured as the actor, must have been entirely composed in Sanskrit

Taking all these points–the episodic nature of भाण, and consequent large number of heroes and heroines, the monologue, the very primitive dramatic technique, the descriptive nature of the plot and the employment of Sanskrit only to the entire exclusion of Prakrit together with the general scheme of evolution of the रूपकs already outlined by me, I am inclined to think that out of all the रूपकs, भाण was the first to evolve

But though the भाण may be taken as earlier than व्यायोग or वीथी or अङ्क, why, it may be asked, should we not take the प्रहसन as the first dramatic type to evolve? It has the same loose dramatic technique suggesting an open-air theatre It has the same coarse nature indicating its popular character *But taking the entire line of evolution* as detailed in the foregoing pages, our working

basis that भाण रूपक was the first form to evolve amongst the रूपकs, fits in very well with the whole scheme Therefore, I am still inclined to take भाण as the first dramatic evolute. For, the one respect in which भाण differs from प्रहसन, is the large number of actors that the latter is allowed To my mind only one actor shows a very primitive character Then, again though our later प्रहसनs show an extremely low state of the society, our earlier ones as represented by मत्तविलास and भगवदज्जुकम्, are dignified in a way, inspite of the lower characters figuring therein So too the loose theatrical technique is seen in the later प्रहसनs, but the earlier ones show a settled conventional dramatic technique, such as is presupposed by any नाटक or प्रकरण Then again प्रहसन shows a variety of languages and is in certain cases mostly in Prakrit For all these reasons भाण seems to be more primitive than प्रहसन[7]

7 I must here point out that though not attested by theory our earlier भाण has a certain element of हास्य present in them शूद्रक in his पद्मप्राभृतकम् depicts his विट as an accomplished person a नागरक but at the same time gives him some traits which are later confined to विदूषक The burst of laughter accompanied by the sounds 'ही ही भो' which every audience would expect at the entrance of a विदूषक and which has later become a regular feature with him, is thrice seen in this विट's case (P 12, 15, 19) The attempt at satirising the degraded position of the Brahmanas which has become a prominent method of exciting humour on the Sanskrit stage is fully seen in पादताडितकम्, where a foolish orthodox Brahmana being kicked by a lady, goes to the Brahmanas and विटs or expiation, and thus

भाण thus seems to me the first dramatic type to evolve and if, now, we want to arrive at the original nature of our नाट्य type, from the foregoing discussoin we will find the following characteristics of our first drama

(1) it was entirely in Sanskrit,

(2) it was discriptive in nature,

(3) it was monologous in form,

(4) and lastly, it was secular in matter. But I wish to make this point quite clear · We have seen that as the रूपक form भाण was the first to develop and both theory and practice prove, beyond a shred of doubt that भाण रूपक was secular in its plot Even in the case of other one act dramas, the theory prescribes secular subjects with regard to प्रहसन and वीथी In व्यायोग, अङ्क and डिम the plot is required to be renowned, but no where a religious phase is indicated डिम has gods etc as heroes and it may have been religious but all the other one act plays were secular in their very nature Thus our नाट्य form was undoubtedly secular in its origin But I have to submit that evidence has another tale to tell with regard to the नृत्य types We have taken भाण, भाणिका, रासक, गोष्ठी and हल्लीसक as the earliest नृत्य types to evolve Out of these भाण and भाणिका are required to have इङ्गित

causes much mirth and other भाण्ड almost regularly introduce one such incident at least in which some शाक्य student is thus ridiculed This feature of causing mirth in the audience by ridiculing the so called learned class has become regular with the प्रहसन

etc., in their plot रासक was connected with कृष्ण. So were गोष्ठी and हल्लीसक Thus all these elementary and early नृत्त types seem to have been religious And, though it is quite possible that our earliest नृत्त forms may have been both religious and secular i e they may have been resorted to on religious as well as secular occasions[9], (for there being no plot, these नृत्त forms had no claim to be called religious or otherwise) yet the tradition connects them with शिव and पार्वती and this may lend colour to its being connected mainly with religious occasions

If this theory of gradual evolution of our नृत्त, नृत्य and नाट्य types as detailed above, is correct, we will have to distinguish between certain stages of growth even in the नाट्य types themselves There will be roughly four distinct periods

(1) The earliest phase of the evolution of our नाट्य types would be represented by a form which required only one actor and one act

(2) नाट्य, in its second period, required many actors but still had only one act

(3) Third period is represented by less complicated types with many acts

(4) Finally, the fourth phase is represented by the full-fledged नाटक and प्रकरण types, which, when fully developed, gradually sent the other

9 Abh actually admits this, for he says that नर्तकादि like डोम्बी etc were performed in the presence of some king or in some temple court yard (देवगृहे राजगृहे वा Abh 177-8)

lesser types into oblivion

And, now, we are in a position to answer the question raised by us at the outset of this volume about our drama being still-born. I have used this word purposely A still-born child is that who at its very birth is dead i e devoid of all powers to develop further So far we have taken the plays of भास and कालिदास to be the earliest and these dramas do create an impression that they have already reached that stage of dramatic development, which is the highest and for which there is no further development possible Our earliest drama thus seems to be still-born but the very theory of gradaul evolution of our drama, as propounded by me, falsifies all such notions The earliest specimen that we possess is a भाण and, though we may not be fortunate enough to recover other representatives of the other early types, it is quite certain that the dramas of भास and कालिदास represent the fourth and the last stage in the evolution of our drama This means that at the commencement of the Christian era or a little earlier, we are already in possession of fully developed dramas which have at their back three distinct stages of evolution Therefore the existance of a long chain of dramas *representative of each of these periods* will have to be admitted This will put the actual beginning of our Drama in a very distant age—how distant, it is difficult to say at present Moreover our drama was, at first, musical and added speech

to it eater and in this light it is likely that the Rgvedic dialogues and monologues represent our elementary नृत्य types, the monologue being sung by one expert actor who may have been a भाणिक[9] and the dialogue being carried on by two opposite parties. But into this realm of conjecture we shall not enter, just at present

9 One of the earliest uses of the word भाण in the sense of speech is seen in बृहदारण्यकोपनिषत् Cf. वाचात्मना तेनात्मनेदं सर्वमसृजत । तं जातमभिव्याददात्स भाणकरोत्सैव वागभवत् ॥ 1, 2, 4

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PLAYS AS QUOTED IN DRAMATURGICAL TEXTS

(Fingures refer to Page nos)

अनर्घराघव ND 193, BP 232, SD 63

अनङ्गसेनाहरिनन्दिनी (प्रकरण, श्रीशक्तिकुमारविरचित) ND 95

अभिनन्दन BP 282

अभिनवराघव (क्षीरस्वामिविरचित) ND 155

अभिरामराघव RS 265, 273

अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल ND 57.69, 154, BP 237, 233 228, SD 64, 66, 69, 70, DR 65, 66 etc Abh 39, 280 etc

अमृतमन्थन BP 250, NS IV, 2

अर्जुनचरित ND 172

आनन्दकोश (प्रहसन) RS 278

इन्दुलेखा (नाटिका) ND 114, 143

इन्दुलेखा (वीथी) BP 251, 231

उत्तरचरित ND 39, 100, etc DR 27, 28 etc

उदयनचरितम् SD 85

उदात्तकुञ्जरकम् (उल्लोप्यक) BP 266

उदात्तराघव ND 66, 111 etc SD 64, 88 DR 76, 79 etc

करुणाकन्दल (अङ्क) SD 286

कनकावतीमाधव (शिल्पक) SD 106

कन्दर्पकेलि (प्रहसन) SD 103

कर्पूरमञ्जरी (सट्टक) BP 269, DR 83

कल्पितम् (रासकम्) SD 105

कलिकेलि (प्रहसन) BP

कामदत्ता (भाणिका) SD 107

कुन्दमाला BP 223, SD 65

कुसुमशेखरविजय (ईहामृग) BP 253, SD 100

कृत्यारावण BP 288, ND 80 83 etc

केलिरैवत (हल्लीश) BP 267, SD 106

कौमुदीमित्राणन्द (प्रकरण) ND 70

क्रीडारसातलम् (श्रीगदितम्) SD 105

गङ्गातरङ्गिका (पारिजातलता) BP 286

गङ्गाभगीरथ (उत्सृष्टिकाङ्क) BP 252

TECHNICAL TERMS

IN this Chapter I append an alphabetical list of the technical terms occurring in the foregoing pages, in the hope that they will be useful for the proper understanding of the text and render it self-contained

अनुभाव [47] The stage of physical effect in the रस theory See रस

अनुसन्धि [46] Sub-divisions of सन्धि See सन्ध्यङ्ग.

आसार [114] A dancing Scene See P 118, l 11

अभिनय Histrionics Indian dramaturgy requires an actor to be clever in the art of acting or अभिनय अभिनय is fourfold आङ्गिक or कायिक, वाचिक, आहार्य and सात्त्विक. आङ्गिक or कायिक embraces all the bodily movements involved in acting Various movements of eyes, nose, ears, eyebrows, hands, feet etc, would come under this type of अभिनय Rules regarding the proper and accurate pronunciations of words and the rules regarding the employment of various languages and dialects would come under the head of वाचिकाभिनय Appropriate dress and toilet would fall under आहार्याभिनय Interpretations of various moods represented in the plot would fall under the province of सात्त्विकाभिनय Theory about these अभिनयs is very elaborate

अभिसारिका [125]. DR (2, 44)

कान्तार्थिनी तु या याति संकेतं साभिसारिका

One who, being lovelorn, goes to meet her

lover or makes him come to her is an अभिसारिका

अर्थप्रकृतिs [47] Sanskrit dramaturgists have prescribed that for the proper accuracy of the plot-development a dramatist should see that at least five points of his plot are quite distinct in his play These five points or original elements (प्रकृति) of the plot are called अर्थप्रकृतिs They are five in number viz बीज, बिन्दु, पताका प्रकरी and कार्य Before the actual composition of the play a playwright has to fit up the proper skeleton of his plot First he has to think about the बीज or the point at which the first germ of the plot becomes visible then he has to think about बिन्दु or the expansion of the germ After the plot expands in this manner, he may sometimes think it necessary to have some episode (पताका) or episodical incident (प्रकरी) for further elaboration of the plot And finally he has to think about the fitting end, the *denouement* (कार्य) These five points that are thus fixed up are called the अर्थप्रकृतिs or the original elements (of the plot), on which the whole plot is developed,

बीज=germ बिन्दु=Expansion of the बीज

पताका=Episode प्रकरी=Episodical incident

कार्य=denouement DR [cf R, 1, 27]

अर्थोद्ग्राह [107] अर्थ+उद्ग्राह Indian music recognises four types of धातुs धातु is defined as प्रबन्धावयव (SR P. 272) Its four types are उद्ग्राह, मेलापक, ध्रुव and आभोग Thus उद्ग्राह is a धातु It is explained by चतुरकल्लिनाथ thus उद्गृह्यते प्रारभ्यते येन गीतं स उद्ग्राह इति प्रबन्धस्य

प्रयत्नावयवोऽन्वर्थमङ्ग । (SR, P 272) It is further explained (SR P. 592)

> आदौ वाद्यप्रबन्धाना शुद्धकूटादिनिर्मित ।
> य खण्डो वाद्यते प्राहुरुद्ग्राह त महत्तमा ॥ १७९

and

तें टे हे तहें तक्वतटे इति वाद्यप्रबन्धपूरणमभ्यासादुद्ग्राप्रबन्ध, ।

Thus it is a particular programme of playing upon beating drums to be played in the beginning of a प्रबन्ध.

अवमर्श [121] Pause See सन्धि

अवस्था [46] With reference to the central action of the plot, our theory prescribes five stages These are called अवस्थाs. They are named as आरम्भ, प्रयत्न, प्राप्त्याशा, नियताप्ति, and फलागम [cf DR, 1 28] Beginning of the action is आरम्भ. The effort that *the hero has to make for the achievement of his* object is प्रयत्न This stage shows that all is not clear sailing for the hero He has to put some effort, as the result of which there might arise some prospect of success, which stage is called प्राप्त्याशा After further effort this prospect turns into practical certainty of achievement, which is therefore termed as नियताप्ति, and finally comes the actual attainment of the result i e. फलागम Thus these five stages refer to the progress of the plot

आरम्भ = Beginning of action प्रयत्न = Effort for the achievement of the object. प्राप्त्याशा = Hope of success. नियताप्ति = Certainty of achievement फलागम = Attainment of Result.

अङ्गहार [16]. In the details of the आङ्गिक अभिनय, our theory has a very detailed classification of the movements of all the limbs of the body. Out of these, harmonious movement of hands and feet, is called करण NS describes 108 करणs. Combinations of these करणs cause अङ्गहारs It is thus defined by Abh.: [illegible] । [illegible] , [illegible]. In an अङ्गहार, the actor performs two or more करणs

[illegible] [106]· A character though not bodily on the stage. yet supposed to be there and with whom the विट in a भाण converses as if with someone actually present on the stage Thus it is a character who is in the space (आकाश), not actually on the stage. Cf. castles in the air, where air is used in the sense of आकाश

आरभटी [58] A वृत्ति, which see

[illegible] [122] Unfolding of the seed of the plot. Or it may be a musical item. Indian music has a technical term called [illegible], wich is probably meant here. It is thus described SR P. 158

[illegible] ।
[illegible] ॥

It is thus a type of [illegible].

[illegible] [70] A type of [illegible], which see.

[illegible] [111] Questions and answers It may refer to [illegible] type of conversations

[illegible] [109] A kind of [illegible].

[illegible] [115]· An assistant of hero.

ऊढा [123] One's own legally married wife. A type of नायिका, which see

कन्या [123] An unmarried girl A type of नायिका, which see.

कलहान्तरिता [123] A type of नायिका, which see

कुलजा [52] A heroine who is born of a noble family.

कुट्टिनी [54] A harlot

कैशिकी [56] A type of वृत्ति, which see

खण्डतार [121] A kind of ताल

ख्यातोद्धत [60] A hero who is reputed in earlier litrature or tradition, is called a ख्यात or a प्रख्यात here, When such a hero has impudent manners in the play he is called ख्यातोद्धत

गणिका [123] A courtezan, a type of नायिका, which see

गाथा [106] A metre, a type of song See SR P. 319

आर्यैव प्राकृते गेया स्यात्स्वचरणाऽयशा।
त्रिपदी षट्पदी गाथेत्यपरे सूरयो जगुः ॥

गर्भ [60] A सन्धि, which see

गर्भाङ्क [51] An act within an act e.g in उत्तरराम or रत्नावलि When in the body of an act, the principal characters of a play are represented as witnessing a play enacted before their eyes, then occurs गर्भाङ्क

चतुरस्र [119] It is a जाति of ताल the mordern चौताल It is named after the number of वर्णs in the principal beat i e. four.

चेट [54] A man servant, usually an accomplice of the विट

दक्षिण [121] A hero who is courteous to all his wives

दण्डद्विदण्डक [114] One or two sticks

दिव्यचारी [107] चारी is *movement of an actress* on the stage, while dancing There are various types of चारीs This is probably the same as आकाशचारी i e the acting interpreting the movement in space

दिव्या [92] A divine heroine like an अप्सरा (e g उर्वशी)

दूती [126] A lady-messenger clever in pursuading lovers to meet one another

देवी [92] Chief queen.

द्विपदक [106] A type of metre, a song See SR P 319 ff

छन्दसा द्विपथेन स्याद्द्विपथ स्वरमुक्तिक ।
तालहीन सतालो वा ॥

This is a synonym of the classical metre दोधक A प्रबन्ध or musical composition in which this metre is employed will also be called द्विपथ

द्विपदी [122] A metre A प्रबन्ध composed in that metre It has करणताल For its composition see SR P 313-4

धीरप्रशान्त [52] A type of नायक, which see.
धीरललित [92] A type of नायक, which see
धीरोदात्त [46] A type of नायक, which see
धीरोद्धत [61] A type of नायक, which see.

ध्रुवा [122] In the actual practice of the performance of a drama, there was a musical programme gone through At the entrance of particular characters in particular scenes, certain songs were sung declaring their entrance These were called ध्रुवाs भरत as quoted in SR (P 90) describes thus

यानि चैव निबद्धानि छन्दोवृत्तिविधानतः ।
मुखप्रतिमुखादीनि गीताङ्गान्यैव सर्वदा ॥
यदाश्रयानि तानि स्युर्ध्रुवासंज्ञानि नाटके ।

Comm on SR (P 90) has this note इति प्रवेशाद्यर्थसूचनादिस्वाभावमन्वर्थता ज्ञेया ।

NS has one whole अध्याय for this–the 42nd.

ध्वनिका [122] Appears to be an item of musical programme.

नटी [46] सूत्रधार's wife

नागरा [121] A type of नायिका, who is accomplished in all the fine arts.

नाट्यालंकार [47] Our dramaturgy recognises 36 decorative elements (अलंकारs) to be employed in a drama Just as there are अलंकारs in Poetics, there are अलंकारs in Dramatics also See NS XVI, which describes these अलंकारs

नान्दी [48] Benedictory verse or verses Sanskrit commentators usually quote the following verse for नान्दी

आशीर्नमस्क्रियारूप श्लोकः काव्यार्थसूचकः ।
नान्दीति कथ्यते

Its main characteristics therefore would be

these (1) It must be benedictory in nature (2) It should suggest the subject-matter of the plot (3) It should have 4, 8 or 12 चरणs.

Practically all our extant dramas begin with a verse which has the above nature and after this first verse the stage-direction नान्द्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधार occurs In certain cases this line appears before the verse also, as in भास's plays As a matter of fact this नान्दी verse is merely a part of the long programme called पूर्वरङ्ग, which had to be gone through before the play actually commenced BP (P 195-7) prescribes 22 elements of this पूर्वरङ्ग, (See P 194, l. 20), out of which नान्दी is 12th compare BP P 196-7

नाडिका [126] half a मुहूर्त See P 126

नायक [46] A hero According to Sanskrit dramaturgy there are many varieties of नायक These varieties are mainly based on two distinct principles From the viewpoint of the nature of the hero, he is classified as धीरप्रशान्त, धीरललित, धीरोदात्त, and धीरोद्धत He is also classified as a lover i e. with reference to his conduct towards his heroine or heroines He is then called दक्षिण (courteous), शठ (deceitful) धृष्ट (shameless), or अनुकूल (agreeable) There are some other principles of division also, but we are here concerned with the first principle only Therefore we shall explain these four varieties

धीरप्रशान्त DR, 2, 4

सामान्यगुणयुक्तस्तु धीरशान्तो द्विजादिक

This suggests that he must have all the quali-

ties of a gentleman, and that he must be particularly self-controlled (धीर) and calm (शान्त)

धीरललित DR, 2, 3

निश्चिन्तो धीरललित कलासक्त सुखी मृदु

His qualities are self-control (धीरत्व), light-heartedness (ललितत्व), no anxiety, fondness for arts (कलासक्ति), happiness and delicacy

धीरोद्धत DR, 2, 6

दर्पमात्सर्यभूयिष्ठो मायाछद्मपरायण ।
धीरोद्धतस्त्वहङ्कारी चलश्चण्डो विकत्थन ॥

Self-controlled, haughty (उद्धत), proud, jealous, deceitful, devoted to magic, egoistic, fickle, irascible and boastful–these are the qualities of the धीरोदात्त hero.

धीरोदात्त, DR. 2, 5

महासत्त्वोऽतिगम्भीर क्षमावानविकत्थन ।
स्थिरो निगूढाहङ्कारो धीरोदात्तो दृढव्रत ॥

Self-controlled, exalted उदात्त very sobre, forbearing, not boastful, steady, with subdued ego, firm of purpose (दृढव्रत) and of great excellence (महासत्त्व)–these are the qualities of the धीरोदात्त hero

नायिका Heroines are of many types First principle to classify them is their marital relations. A legally married wife is called स्वीया or स्वा. Another's married wife, with whom the hero comes in contact is called अन्या or परकीया A courtezan with whom *the hero has relations* is *called* a वेश्या or सामान्या or गणिका These are thus described in DR

स्वाऽन्या साधारणस्त्रीति तद्गुणा नायिका त्रिधा । 2 24
अन्यस्त्री कन्यकोढा च नान्योढाऽङ्गिरसे क्वचित् ।
कन्यानुरागमिच्छात कुर्यादङ्गाङ्गिसमाश्रयम् ॥ 2, 32
साधारणस्त्री गणिका कलाप्रागल्भ्यधौर्त्ययुक् । 2, 23
छन्नकामसुखार्थाज्ञस्वतन्त्राहयुपण्डकान् ।
रक्तेव रञ्जयेदाढयान्नि स्वान्मात्रा विवासयेत् ॥ 2, 34
रक्तेव त्वप्रहसने नैषा दिव्यनृपाश्रये । 2, 35

Thus from the viewpoint of marital relations the heroine may be स्वीया i e one's own wife, or अन्या i e a कन्या (a maiden) or another's wife (परकीया), or सामान्या i e a courtezan 2, 32 makes it clear that परकीया should never figure in the principle रस 2, 33–34 count the qualities necessary in a सामान्या

Again, according to her age and consequent development of her own nature she is classfied as मुग्धा (Inexperienced) मध्या (Half-experienced and प्रगल्भा (Experienced) or प्रौढा These are thus described in DR

मुग्धा नववय कामा रतौ वामा मृदु क्रुधि । 2, 26
मध्योद्यद्यौवनानङ्गा मोहान्तसुरतक्षमा । 2, 27
धीरा सोत्प्रासवक्रोक्त्या मध्या साश्रुकृतागसम् ।
खेदयेद्दयित कोपादधीरा परुषाक्षरम् ॥ 2, 28
यौवनान्धा स्मरोन्मत्ता प्रगल्भा दयिताङ्गके ।
विलीयमानेवानन्दाद्रतारम्भेऽप्यचेतना ॥ 2, 29
सावहित्थादरोदास्ते रतौ धीरेतरा क्रुधा ।
सतर्ज्य ताडयेन्मध्या मध्या धीरेव त वदेत् ॥ 2 30
द्वेधा ज्येष्ठा कनिष्ठा चेत्यमुग्धा द्वादशोदिता ॥ 2, 31

मुग्धा has the desire of new youth, is bashful in love-sports, and gentle in anger मध्या has the love of rising youth, and is capable of enjoying

love-sports till fainting 2,28 describes these sub-varieties of मध्या according as she is धीरा, मध्या or अधीरा in her anger, towards her lover 2,29 describes a प्रगल्भा or प्रौढा She is blinded by youth, is intoxicated with love, absorbing herself as it were, into the body of her lover through joy, becomes unconscious even at the beginning of love-sports 2,30 describes the three varieties of प्रगल्भा according as she is धीरा, मध्या or अधीरा in her anger towards her lover Again both these मध्या and प्रौढा can be ज्येष्ठा (an elder wife) or कनिष्ठा (younger wife)

Again with reference to her mental condition due to her relations with the hero, a heroine is classified as स्वाधीनपतिका, वासकसज्जा, विरहोत्कण्ठिता, खण्डिता, कलहान्तरिता, विप्रलब्धा, प्रोषितप्रिया and अभिसारिका

They are thus described in DR.

आसामष्टाववस्थाः स्युः स्वाधीनपतिकादिकाः । 2, 36
आसन्नायत्तरमणा हृष्टा स्वाधीनभर्तृका । 22, 39
मुदा वासकसज्जा स्वं मण्डयत्येष्यति प्रिये । 2, 38
चिरयत्यव्यलीके तु विरहोत्कण्ठितोन्मना । 2, 39
ज्ञातेऽन्यासङ्गविकृते खण्डितेर्ष्याकषायिता । 2, 40
कलहान्तरिताऽमर्षाद्विधूतेऽनुशयार्तियुक् । 2, 41
विप्रलब्धोक्तसमयमप्राप्तेऽतिविमानिता । 2, 42
दूरदेशान्तरस्थे तु कार्यतः प्रोषितप्रिया । 2, 43
कामार्ताऽभिसरेत्कान्तं सारयेद्वाऽभिसारिका । 2, 44
चिन्तानिःश्वासखेदाश्रुवैवर्ण्यग्लान्यभूषणैः ।
युक्ताः षडन्त्या द्वे चाद्ये क्रीडौज्ज्वल्यप्रहर्षिते । 2, 45

When the lover is by her side and at her service, she is called स्वाधीनभर्तृका One that decorates

herself to meet her lover when he comes, is called वासकसज्जा One whose lover tarries in coming to her, inspite of her being non guilty is called विरहोत्कण्ठिता One who has discovered her lover having been disfigured through his love-sports with another woman is खण्डिता One who has repulsed her lover through anger and then suffers remorse is कलहान्तरिता One who is greatly insulted by her lover, by not turning up at the agreed rendezvous, is called विप्रलब्धा One whose husband has gone abroad on business is called प्रोषितप्रिया One, who being love-lorn goes to meet her lover herself, or makes him to come to her is called अभिसारिका 1,45 gives the characteristics of these नायिकाs

निगरण or निगारण [108] An item of musical programme

निर्वहण [62] संधि, which see

पताका [47] An अर्थप्रकृति, which see

परकीया [73] Another's wife, A type of नायिका, which see

पाचाली [07] A kind of रीति

पीठमर्द [07] He is called a पताकानायक, He is thus described in DR

पताकानायकास्त्वन्यः पीठमर्दो विचक्षणः ।
तस्यैवानुचरो भक्तः किंचिदूनश्च तद्गुणैः ॥ २, ९

He is intelligent, following the नायक, devoted to him and is slightly inferior to the नायक in all his qualities BP describes him thus (P 94)

स पीठमर्दो विश्वास्य कुपितस्त्रीप्रसादकः ।

पुनर्भू [128] A heroine who has remarried

प्रकरी [47] An अर्थप्रकृति, which see

प्रमदताल [114] A type of ताल

प्रतिमुख [115] A सन्धि, which see

प्रवेशक [47] प्रवेशक and विष्कम्भक are two introductory scenes. When a dramatist thinks that in the representation of his plot there are some incidents which are not very important from the dramatic viewpoint, but which are such as would be inevitable for connecting the link of the plot, he suggests such incidents by such scenes e g in उत्तरराम, in the first act, राम abandons सीता The 2nd act proper begins after 12 years with राम going to kill शम्बूक What happened during these 12 years (e. g the birth of लव and कुश etc) is necessary for the proper appreciation of the plot So the dramatist puts an interlude scene and suggests these incidents Such scenes are of two types called प्रवेशक and विष्कम्भक. They have following characteristics

प्रवेशक (1) It should not occur in beginning of the first act. It can occur in the beginning of any other act (2) In it all the characters should speak in Prakrit, i e all the characters figuring therein are low ones

विष्कम्भक (1) It can occur in the beginning of any act, even the first. (2) It is called शुद्धविष्कम्भक if all the characters therein are such as use Sanskrit only and it is called संकीर्णविष्कम्भक if some

of the characters speak in Sanskrit and some in Prakrit

प्रस्तावना [48] Several types of प्रस्तावना are explained earlier (See P 48) Following are the requisites of a प्रस्तावना

(1) It should occur in the beginning of a play (2) In it सूत्रधार should converse with his wife who is called नटी or his attendant who is called पारिपार्श्वक or मारिष or विदूषक Or he may enter alone and address the audience (3) In the course of this conversation or speech, the audience should be informed about the name of this play, the name of the author and his history (4) Before closing the प्रस्तावना the सूत्रधार should introduce the character or the incidents of the actual beginning of the first act

All these features are not present in all our extant plays For instance in भास's plays only the सूत्रधार enters and introduces the play and goes away, and (3) Is altogether absent In कालिदास's dramas, except the personal history of the auther all other points are seen While in later plays like those of हर्ष and भवभूति all these details are present

प्रौढा [126] A heroine experienced in love-sports See नायिका

बन्धकी [63] A harlot

बिन्दु [45] An अर्थप्रकृति, which see

बीज [45] An अर्थप्रकृति which see

भाननाल [106] A type of ताल भानताले चतुर्बिंदु नगणश्च

विलासवान् । T SR. I, 444

भरतवाक्य Though nowhere found in theory, almost all our extant dramas append a verse at the end of the play, which is called भरतवाक्य In this verse the hero of the play asks for a blessing from the most revered personality in the play It has been suggested that this verse was recited in honour of भरत who is supposed to be the founder of dramatic science on this earth. Others think that it is a mass prayer by all the actors together, as one of the synonyms for an actor is भरत For this discussion see my paper 'Bhagavadajjukam and Bharatavākya' in IHQ

भारती [46] A वृत्ति, which see

भाव [47] An emotion See रस

भोगिनी [123] A type of नायिका BP describes her thus (P 291)

> स्वयं प्रवृत्तसुरता प्रवृत्ते भोगकर्मणि ।
> सपत्नीनामसहना भोगिनीति निगद्यते ॥

When the love-sports begin, she herself makes the start and she does not tolerate co wives

मत्तपाली [106] An item of musical programme

मत्ताल [114] A type of ताल । मत्तालो विरामान्तद्विबिन्दुः चतुर्लघु SR I, 440

मागधी [106] A musical song is called गीत मागधी is a type of गीत It is thus defined SR P 141

> गीरता कलायामथाद्या विलम्बितलय पदम् ।
> द्वितीयायां मध्यलय तत्र द्रुतलयं तुरीयम् ॥

सतृतीयपदे ते च तृतीयस्यां द्रुते लये ।
इति त्रिरावृत्तपदां मागधीं जगदुर्बुधा ॥

मात्रा [106] Time taken in pronouncing one लघुवर्ण This can be a type of ताल etc also

मानिनी [92] A type of नायिका One who, feeling insulted by the conduct of her husband is angry with him is called a मानिनी

मारिष [46] An attendant of सूत्रधार, पारिपार्श्विक

मार्गनिका [106] An item of the musical programme

मुख [47] A सन्धि, which see

मुग्धा [92] A heroine inexperienced in love-sports See also नायिका

मुरजाक्षरवाद्य [114] A beating drum, probably नौबत

यति [121] Pause in music

रथ्या [106] An item of the musical programme a ताल or the like

रस [47] Theory of रस is peculiar to Indian dramaturgy It has also played a very important part in the science of Poetics To understand this theory let us take an example An actor stages the part of राम, in separation from सीता He wishes to create a tragic feeling in the mind of the audience. The process by which he will achieve his end will pass through the following stages

[I] (a) This feeling originally relies upon राम and सीता If these two are non-existant the feeling

will not arise at all Therefore these two-hero and heroine-are the sources from which the feeling arises (b) This feeling, after thus rising, is nourished or excited by the environments like clouds etc So far the process is mostly unconscious But soon, these two stages begin to act upon the body and mind of the actor [2] Due to the physical effect, he has tears in his eyes etc [3] Due to the mental effect, first there arises a vague feeling of dejection, etc. At this stage the process begins to be conscious, and soon [4] this vague feeling if nourished, takes the form of a permanent mood which we call grief Here the process becomes fully conscious

These stages, in the terminology of रस theory, are designated as follows

[1] (a) The hero and the heroine, on whom the feeling originally rests are called आलम्बनविभाव [1] (b) The environment which excites the feeling is called उद्दीपनविभाव Both these form one stage called the विभाव stage [2] The physical effect of the first stage is called अनुभाव or सात्त्विक अनुभाव [3] Its vague transitory mental effect is called व्यभिचारि-भाव [4] And the last stage where this transitory mental effects become deep-rooted and take the form of permanent mood is called स्थायिभाव Thus [1] (a) and (b) are विभाव, [2] is अनुभाव and [3] and [4] are भाव

When this process goes on in the mind of

the actor it is subjective only but as the actor goes on interpreting the various stages by his histrionics, speech etc, the audience also goes through the same stages Here the process becomes objective also When this process (objective as well as subjective), reaching the last stage of स्थायी भाव, is completed, the minds of the audience experience a subtle pleasure which is termed as रस रस is the ultimate pleasurable mental condition, which is the outcome of the *whole* of the above process

अनुभावs are named as स्तम्भ, प्रलय, रोमाञ्च, स्वेद, वैवर्ण्य, वेपथु, अश्रु and वैस्वर्य व्यभिचारीs are named as निर्वेद, ग्लानि शंका, असूया, मद, श्रम, आलस्य दैन्य, चिन्ता, मोह स्मृति, धृति, व्रीडा, चपलता, हर्ष, आवेग, जडता, गर्व, विषाद, औत्सुक्य, निद्रा, विस्मृति, त्रास, वितर्क, स्वप्न, विबोध, अमर्ष, अवहित्थ, उग्रता, मति, व्याधि, उन्माद, मरण स्थायीभावs are the following रति, हास, शोक, क्रोध, उत्साह, भय, जुगुप्सा, विस्मय, and (निर्वेद) And the रसs are शृङ्गार, हास्य, करुण, रौद्र, वीर, भयानक, वीभत्स अद्भुत and (शान्त)

रेचकs [16] Separate (not simultaneous) movements of hands, feet, waist, and head. A division of कायिकाभिनय

लय [121] Rhythm created by reciting syllables in proper time-measure

लास्याङ्गs [68] लास्य is the gentle dance Theory recognises ten types or elements of लास्य BP describes them thus

गेयपदं स्थितपाठ्यमासीनं पुष्पगण्डिका ।
प्रच्छेदकं त्रिमूढं च सैन्धवाख्यं द्विमूढकम् ॥
उत्तमोत्तमकं चैवमुक्तप्रत्युक्तमेव च ।
लास्ये दशविधं ह्येतदङ्गनिर्देशरूपकम् ।

वीणादिवाद्ययोगेन सहित यत्र भाव्यते ।
ललितं नायिकागीतं तद्गेयपदमुच्यते ॥
चञ्चत्पुटादिना वाक्याभिनयो नायिकाकृत ।
भूमिचारीप्रचारेण स्थितपाठ्य तदुच्यते ॥
भ्रूनेत्रपादचलनविलासाभिनयान्वितम् ।
योऽज्ञमासीनया पाठ्यमासीनं तदुदाहृतम् ॥
नानाविधेन वाद्येन नानातालल यान्वितम् ।
लास्यं प्रयुज्यते यत्र सा ज्ञेया पुष्पगण्डिका ॥
अन्यासङ्गमशङ्किन्या नायकस्यातिरोषया ।
प्रेमच्छेदप्रकृष्ट लास्य प्रच्छेदकं विदु ॥
अनिष्ठुरश्लक्ष्णपद समवृत्तैरलङ्कृतम् ।
नाट्य पुरुषभावाढ्य त्रिमूढकमुदाहृतम् ॥
देशभाषाविशेषेण चलद्वलयशृङ्खलम् ।
लास्य प्रयुज्यते यत्र तत्सैन्धवमुदाहृतम् ॥
चारीभिर्ललिताभिश्च चित्रार्थाभिनयान्वितम् ।
स्पष्टभावरसोपेत लास्य यत्तद्द्विमूढकम् ॥
अपज्ञातपार्श्वस्थं गेयभावविभूषितम् ।
लास्यं सोत्कण्ठवाक्य यदुत्तमोत्तमकं भवेत् ॥
कोपप्रसादजनित साधिक्षेपपदाश्रयम् ।
वाक्यं तदुक्तप्रत्युक्त द्वयो प्रश्नोत्तरात्मकम् ॥

Thus there are ten लास्याङ्ग viz गेयपद = mere song, स्थितपाठ्य = recitation by one who is standing, आसीन = Recitation by one who is seated, पुष्पगण्डिका = Dance in accompaniment with various types of musical instruments, प्रच्छेदक = Song, expressing the breach of love, by one who is a खण्डिता, त्रिमूढ = (it is also called त्रिगूढ) Representation, mainly of males, with समवृत्त (i e even metres) and gentle words, सैन्धव = Dance, with bangles and girdles shaking expressed in देशभाषा, द्विमूढकम् (it is also called द्विगूढकम्) = Dance with various types of histrionics,

and clear emotions, by means of various वाक्यs, उत्तमोत्तम = Speech of one who is anxious and who is unmindful of persons by his side, and उक्तप्रत्युक्त = Fierce conversation caused by anger

These लास्याङ्गs may be employed in a drama at several places

SR gives a set of देशीलास्याङ्गs which are worth noticing here (P 7934)

चालिश्चालिवडश्चाथ लढि सूकमुरोङ्गणम् ।
धसकश्चाङ्गहार स्य दोयारो विहसी मन ॥
लास्याङ्गानि दशैतानि देशी देशीविदो विदु ।
कोमलं सविलास च मधुर लास्ययुक् ॥
नातिद्रुत नातिमन्द स्यघतापचुर तथा ।
पादोरुकटिबाहूनां यौगपद्येन चालनम् ॥
चालि सा सौन्दर्यसामुख्यप्राया चालिवडो भवेत् ।
सुकुमार तिरश्चीनं विलासासिक च यत् ॥
युगपत्कटिबाहूनां चालन सा लढिर्मता ॥
कर्णयोर्हविबहुल लसल्लोलावतसयो ।
विलम्बेनाविलम्बेन सूकं तलयचालनम् ॥
विलम्बेनाविलम्बेन कुचयोर्भुजशीर्षयो ।
ललित चालनं तिर्यक्तज्ज्ञा प्राहुरोङ्गणम् ॥
धमक स्यात्सुललित स्तनाधोनयन लयात् ।
सतालललितोपेता कमात्कार्यां द्वयोर्नेति ॥
धनुर्वेदङ्गहार स्यादिति नि शङ्कभाषितम् ।
विचित्तिर्येगधो भूम्नौ गतिरोयारको मत ॥
स्मित स्याद्विदषी यस्तु शृङ्गाररसनिर्भर ।
अभ्यस्तादन्य एवातिसूक्ष्मप्रत्ययमङ्गिभार ॥
गीतादेरागत स्यायस्तल्लयात्मनो मतम् ।

These are, of course, not meant here

वसन्त [106] A type of ताल See वसन्तो म्गौ। SR D, 451

वर्त [106] A प्रबन्ध See SR P 305

वर्णताल [104] A type of ताल, वर्णभिनो द्रुतो लोग SR P 436

वर्धनिक [122] A type of ताल

वाचिक [70] A type of अभिनय, which see

वाद्यताल [16] A type of ताल

वासकताल [125] A type of ताल

वासकसज्जा [115] A type of नायिका, which see

विट [52] One of the assistants of the hero He is thus defined.

एकविद्यो विटश्चान्यो DR, 2, 13

एकविद्यो विटस्तस्य कामतन्त्रेषु कौशलम् BP, P 94

His main qualification was his proficiency in the art of love Therefore he alone figures in भाण

विदूषक [46] One of the assistants of the hero He is thus defined

हास्यकृच्च विदूषकः DR, 2, 13

विकृताङ्गवचोवेषैर्हास्यकृत्स्याद्विदूषकः ।
पीठमर्दस्य पुरतः प्रयोक्ता नायिकादिषु ॥ BP. 44

विभाव [47] See रस

विमर्श [60] Same as अवमर्श, which see

विराम [105] A word used for 'a scene'

वीथ्यङ्ग [60] Following are the वीथ्यङ्गs (DR, 3, 13-26)

उद्घात्यकवलगिते प्रपञ्चत्रिगते छलम् ।
वाक्केल्यधिबले गण्ड अवस्यन्दितनालिके ।

असत्प्रलापव्याहारमृदवाणि त्रयोदश । 3, 13
गूढार्थपदपर्यायमाला प्रश्नोत्तरस्य वा ।
यत्रान्योन्य समालापो द्वेधोद्घात्यं तदुच्यते ॥ 3, 14
यत्रैकत्र समावेशात्कार्यं अन्यत्प्रसाधयेत् ।
प्रस्तुतेऽन्यत्र वाऽन्यत्स्यात्तच्चावलगित द्विधा ॥
असद्भूत मिथ स्तोत्र प्रपञ्चो हास्यकृन्मत । 3, 16
श्रुतिसाम्यादनेकार्थयोजन त्रिगत त्विह ।
नटादित्रितयालाप पूर्वरङ्गे तदिष्यते ॥ 3, 17
प्रियाभैरप्रियैर्वाक्यैर्विलोभ्य छलनाच्छलम् । 3, 18
विनिवृत्त्याऽस्य वाक्केली द्विस्त्रि प्रत्युक्तितोऽपि वा । 3, 19
अन्योन्यवाक्याधिक्योक्ति स्पर्धयाऽधिबल भवेत् । 3 20
गण्ड प्रस्तुतसम्बन्धिभिन्नार्थं सहसोदितम् । 3, 21
रसोक्तस्यान्यथा व्याख्या यत्रावस्यन्दित हि तत् । 3, 22
सोपहासा निगूढार्था नालिकैव प्रहेलिका । 3, 23
असम्बद्धकथाप्रायोऽसत्प्रलापो यथोत्तर 2, 24
अन्यार्थमेव व्याहारो हास्यलोभकर वच । 2, 25
दोषा गुणा गुणा दोषा यत्र स्युर्मृदव हि तत् । 2, 26

In the body of a regular-full fledged drama these served the purpose of introductory elements DR has a note to that effect

एव मन्यन्तमेनार्थं पात्र चाक्षिप्य सूत्रभृत् ।
प्रस्तावनान्ते निर्गच्छेत् ततो वस्तु प्रपञ्चयेत् ॥ 2, 27

सूत्रधार, at the end of the प्रस्तावना should introduce the plot or a character thereof, by means of any one of these elements

1 उद्घात्य=It happens when there is mutual conversation or series of questions and answers, with synonymous words, having ambiguous sense

2 अवलगित would occur when, due to coincidence, opposite objects are fulfilled or when in the work

in hand, some other end is achieved

For instance उद्घात्य would occur when शकुन्तला on the verge of being united with the King got rebuff from him, and the second would occur, when owing to some coincidence, one gets his इष्ट. In the first अनिष्ट comes up from the प्रस्तुत, in the second इष्ट follows

3 प्रपञ्च is constituted when there is mutual humourous praise, through untrue speech

4. त्रिगत happens when many interpretations of some speech, are possible on account of resemblence in sound

5 छल occurs when deception takes place through temptation caused by अप्रिय speeches, though they sound like प्रिय ones

6. वाक्केलि would happen when some incomplete speech is cut off in the middle significantly, or when there are two or three retorts

7 अधिबल *occurs when there is speech which*, through rivalry, shows superiority in mutual speech

8 गण्ड when, with regard to the प्रस्तुत speech, something carrying a diffirent sense is uttered all of a sudden, it is गण्ड ?

9 अवस्यन्दित occurs when a speech full of रस is explained away in some other way

10 नालिका is a speech like प्रहेलिका in which there is joke and which has some hidden sense

11 असत्प्रलाप is improper prattling, constituted mainly of irrelavent talks

12 व्याहार is that speech which produces humour and temptation hinting at some other sense altogether

13 मृदव is caused when faults are represented as qualities and qualities as faults

वृत्ति [56] वृत्ति is a style They are called कैशिकी, सात्वती आरभटी and भारती They are thus discribed in DR

तद्व्यापारात्मिका वृत्तिश्चतुर्धा तत्र कैशिकी ।
गीतनृत्यविलासाद्यैर्मृदु शृङ्गारचेष्टितै । 2, 77
नर्मतत्स्फूर्जतत्स्फोटतद्गर्भैश्चतुरङ्गिका । 2, 78
वैदग्ध्यक्रीडित नर्म प्रियोपच्छन्दनात्मकम् ।
हास्येनैव सशृङ्गारभयेन विहित त्रिधा ।
आत्मोपक्षेपसभोगमानै शृङ्गार्यपि त्रिधा ।
शुद्धमङ्गभय द्वेधा त्रेधा वाग्वेशचेष्टितै ॥
सर्वं सहास्यमित्येव नर्माष्टादशधोदितम् । 2, 79
नर्मस्फूर्जं सुखारम्भो भयान्तो नवसङ्गमे । 2, 80
नर्मस्फोटस्तु भयान्तो सूचितोऽल्परसो लवै । 2, 81
छन्ननेत्रप्रतीचारो नर्मगर्भोऽर्थहेतवे ।
अङ्गै सहास्यनिर्हास्यैरेभिरेपात्र कैशिकी ॥ 2, 82
विशोका सात्वती सत्त्वशौर्यत्यागदयार्जवै ।
सलापोत्थापकावस्यां सघात्य परिवर्तक ॥ 2,83
संलापको गभीरोक्तिर्नानाभावरसा मिथ । 2, 84
उत्थापकस्तु यत्रादौ युद्धायोत्थापयेत्परम् । 2, 85
मन्त्रार्थदेवशक्त्यादे साघात्य सघभेदनम् । 2, 86
प्रारब्धोत्थानकार्यान्यकरणात्परिवर्तक । 2, 87
एभिरङ्गैश्चतुर्धेय सात्वत्यारभटी पुन ।
मायेन्द्रजालसग्रामक्रोधोद्भ्रान्तादिचेष्टितै ॥
सक्षिप्तिका स्यात्संफेटो वस्तूत्थानावपातने । 2, 88
सक्षिप्तवस्तुरचना सक्षिप्ति शिल्पयोगत ।

पूर्वेनतृमित्र्याऽन्ये नेत्रन्तान्परिग्रहम् ॥ 2, 89
सफेटस्तु घनाघात कृदसत्वरोद्भवो । 2, 90
मायाद्युत्थाति वस्तु वस्तूत्थापननिष्यते । 2, 91,
अवपातस्तु निष्कामप्रवेशत्रासविद्रवै । 2 92
एभिरङ्गैश्चतुर्भेर 2, 93

भारती संस्कृतप्रायो वाग्व्यापारो नटाश्रय ।
भेदै प्ररोचनायुक्तैर्वीथीप्रहसनामुखै । 3, 5
उन्मुखीकरण तत्र प्रशंसात प्ररोचना । 3, 6

BP has the following for भारती वृत्ति P 228

या वाक्प्रधाना पुरुषप्रयोज्या स्त्रीवर्जिता संस्कृतपाठ्ययुक्ता ।
स्वनामधेयैर्भरतै प्रयोज्या सा भारती नाम भवेत वृत्ति ॥

Thus there are four वृत्तिs कैशिकी is soft, सात्वती is grand, आरभटी terrible and भारती is eloquent

वेश्या [52] A courtezan.

व्यभिचारी [47] stage of transitory mental effect in the रस theory See रस

सात्वती [58] A वृत्ति, which see

सात्त्विक [17] Same as अनुभाव See रस Also a type of अभिनय, which see.

सामान्या [73] A courtezan See also नायिका

सुताल [119] A kind of ताल

सूत्रधार [16] The manager of a dramatic company

संधि [47] Like the अर्थप्रकृतिs and अवस्थाs, संधिs too are essential for the plot-structure of a play In the plot of a play, sometimes we get well-defined junctures These are called संधिs Following is

the scheme as given in DR

> अन्तरैकार्थसम्बन्ध संधिरेकान्वये सति । 1, 35
> मुखप्रतिमुखे गर्भ सावमर्शोपसंहृति । 1, 36
> मुख बीजसमुत्पत्तिर्नानार्थरससम्भवा ।
> अङ्गानि द्वादशैतस्य बीजारम्भसमन्वयात् । 1, 37
> लक्ष्यालक्ष्यतयोद्भेदस्तस्य प्रतिमुख भवेत ।
> बिन्दुप्रयत्नानुगमादङ्गान्यस्य त्रयोदश ॥ 1, 51
> गर्भस्तु दृष्टनष्टस्य बीजस्यान्वेषण मुहु ।
> द्वादशाङ्ग पताका स्यान्न वा स्यात्प्राप्तिसम्भव ।
> क्रोधेनावमर्शेद्यत्र व्यसनाद्वा विलोभनात् ।
> गर्भनिर्भिन्नबीजार्थ सोऽवमर्शोऽङ्गसंग्रह ॥ 1, 81,
> बीजवन्तो मुखाद्यर्था विप्रकीर्णा यथायथम् ।
> ऐकार्थ्यमुपनीयन्ते यत्र निर्वहण हि तत् ॥ 1, 96

Five सन्धि are मुख प्रतिमुख, गर्भ, अवमर्श and निर्वहण In मुख, we begin with the commencement of बीज and go through different developments of बीज till we reach बिन्दु मुख has 12 sub-divisions (सन्ध्यङ्ग) Thus in the body of मुख itself, the first utterance which would point to the seed is उपक्षेप, its extension is परिकर, etc In प्रतिमुख, the love that is produced as the seed, is sometimes visible and sometimes invisible but through the effort of the hero, the plot is developing to gain its end It has 13 sub divisions, which are based on बिन्दु and प्रयत्न and therefore, there must be some progress made in the बीज Thus throughout these 13 divisions we have effects to develop that love which sprang up in the first stages-मुख-बीज and आरम्भ In प्रतिमुख the plot should progress without obstacles In गर्भ the following points should be present

(1) बीज, that is made manifest should be lost sight of

(2) There must be renewed search after it

(3) There may or may not be पताका

(4) There must be प्रत्याशा,

Thus गर्भ differs from मुख and प्रतिमुख in as much as these two were based on corresponding two elements of आरम्भ and अर्थप्रकृति, while गर्भ is based on प्रत्याशा, an element of अवस्था only पताका an element of अर्थप्रकृति may or may not be present here It has 12 sub-divisions

After the बीज is lost sight of in गर्भ i e after the action of the plot is hampered in गर्भ, one has to think properly about the means of regaining it This thinking is called अवमर्श Thus upto गर्भ, there is a continuous progression of action and the plot is at its highest in गर्भ Then comes some pause or thinking This is अवमर्श This has 13 sub divisions निर्वहण, the last संधि, should harmonise all the threads of मुख, बीज etc , scattered over throughout the drama It is the same as कार्य or फलागम It has 14 sud-divisions

It will be thus seen that अवस्था, अर्थप्रकृति and संधि have certain parallel elements Thus बीज-आरम्भ-मुख, बिन्दु-प्रयत्न-प्रतिमुख, पताका (not always)-प्राप्त्याशा गर्भ, कार्य फलागम-निर्वहण.

सन्ध्यङ्ग Every संधि has several सन्ध्यंग In all they make 64. Accompanying table shows them Following six are said to be the motives of these सन्ध्यङ्ग. Arrangement of the desired plot, concealment of that which should be concealed, manifestation of proper subjects, attachment, wonder caused by the representation and no unnecessary condensation of the narrative

रतिया [123] A type of नायिका, which see.

दुग्मलित [54] A type of song

- वस्तु
  - अर्थप्रकृतिs
    - बीज, बिन्दु, पताका, प्रकरी, कार्य
  - अवस्थाs
    - आरम्भ, प्रयत्न, प्राप्त्याशा, नियताप्ति, फलागम
  - सन्धिs
    - मुख
      - उपक्षेप, परिकर, परिन्यास, विलोभन युक्ति, प्राप्ति, समाधान, विधान, परिभावना, उद्भेद, भेद, करण — 12
    - प्रतिमुख
      - विलास, परिसर्प, विधूत, शम, नर्म, नर्मद्युति, प्रगमन, निरोध, पर्युपासनम्, वज्र, पुष्प, उपन्यास, वर्णसंहार — 13
    - गर्भ
      - अभूताहरण, मार्ग, रूप, उदाहरण, क्रम, संग्रह, अनुमान, तोटक, अधिबल, उद्वेग, संभ्रम, आक्षेप — 12
    - अवमर्श
      - अपवाद, संफेट, विद्रव, द्रव, शक्ति, द्युति, प्रसंग, छलन, व्यवसाय, विरोधन, प्ररोचना, विचलन, आदान — 13
    - उपसंहृति or निर्वहण
      - सन्धि, विबोध, ग्रथन, निर्णय, परिभाषण, प्रसाद, आनन्द, समय, कृति, भाषण, उपगूहन, पूर्वभाव, उपसंहार, प्रशस्ति — 14 = 64

INDEX I
Sanskrit (Names and Subjects)

INDEX II
English (Names and Subjects)

INDEX I

Sanskrit (Names and Subjects)

INDEX II

English (Names and Subjects)

ERRATA

Page	Correct
13, 12	॰ह्रावैव
17, Last	BP
21, 14	add, P 208
21, 16	॰हँस्नै
29, 21	न द्
31, 10	स्प
13	seems
17	स्प, स्प्
35, 17	Corroborate
36, 5	gaining
56, 21	erotic
58, last	विमर्श
59, 2	वीरभद्र॰
62, 25	शङ्कर
28	NS,
64, 2	भगवदज्जुकम्
78, 13	difficulty
91, 9	160
109, 20	add no
112, 19	add (BP P 263 L 23 to P 265 L 7)
23	भेदनाद्
25	सुकुमारोद्धतेत्युद्धेर्णायितमभिविलक्षणा
113, 7	चतुर्भि॰
13	वध्वा
16	॰सयुक्तै
17	॰शुष्कवर्णप्रयोग॰
116, 20	264
117, 15	form
119, last	त्रिपुरमर्दनम्
128, throughout	NSD
133, last	नाट्य, instead of नृत्य
134, 18	उपरूपकs
152, 3	variants
167, 1	later
179, 13	hero
27	modern
181, 27	श्लोक
183, 14	धीरोद्धत
189, 23	॰निन्द्रन्त
207, 1, 8	term
208, 2, 6	वेणीसंहार